DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 550		HE 001 668

AUTHOR	Alter, Chester M.
TITLE	University Resources for International Development.
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 68
NOTE	84p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.30
DESCRIPTORS	Criteria, Educational Resources, Evaluation Criteria, *Higher Education, *International Organizations, *International Programs, Resources, *Selection, *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Agency for International Development

ABSTRACT

In 1964, John W. Gardner outlined some criteria that should be appied in the selection of universities that would serve as AID contractors. These criteria were: (1) the extent to which the universities had developed their resources in the international field; (2) the caliber of the faculty in the key fields; (3) the extent of interdisciplinary work and programs at the insitituion; (4) available research resources relevant to development; (5) the administrative capacity to handle overseas projects; (6) relevant earlier experience in overseas work; (7) quality of personnel assigned to the specific project; and (8) the degree of university commitment to this project. In Part 1, institutions are divided into 8 categories - land grant, other public institutions, public university branches, large private institutions, liberal arts colleges, large engineering and science institutions, junior colleges, and consortia - and comments are made about the extent to which these various types fulfill the criteria. Part 2 discusses the resources and capabilities of major types of consortia, and other cooperative groups. Part 3 discusses the impact of international involvement on the university. General comments and observations are made in Part 4. (AF)

ED0 41550

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Chester M. Alter

A report prepared for the
Agency for International Development
under contract with
The Academy for Educational Development

☆☆☆☆

June 1968

HE001668

PREFACE

Because A.I.D. relies so heavily on American Universities, it is important that we recognize clearly that our universities do not all have the same interests and capabilities. This report focuses on variations within the American academic community and sets a framework for better decisions by A.I.D. in working with that community.

I believe the report will also be helpful to university administrators by setting forth some of the criteria used by A.I.D. in identifying and selecting colleges and universities for development projects.

WILLIAM S. GAUD, *Administrator*
Agency for International Development
May 1968

CONTENTS

Preface iii

Acknowledgements vi

Contents v

PART I—CRITERIA FOR SELECTION 1
- Introduction 1
- Index to Criteria 9
- Extent of Resources 10
- Caliber of Faculty 16
- Interdisciplinary Programs 20
- Research Resources 26
- Administration 30
- Overseas Experience 35
- Quality of Personnel 39
- Institutional Commitment 43

PART II—CONSORTIA AND OTHER COOPERATIVE INSTRUMENTALITIES 49
- Introduction 49
- Types of Consortia 50
- Special Criteria 51

PART III—IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT 49
- Incidence of Faculty and Student Foreign Travel 62

PART IV—COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS 64
- Availability of Information 64
- Establishment of Inventory 65
- Resources 66
- Overseas Activities 67
- AID Contracts 69
- University Organization and Structure 70

APPENDICES 71
- A. Background 71
- B. List of 108 Institutions in Sample 76
- C. List of Study Team Members 78
- D. List of Advisory Committee Members 80

Acknowledgements

The author was employed by the Academy for Educational Development as a consultant and assigned the responsibility for the writing and preparation of this final study. Although I gladly assume full responsibility to the Academy for its contents, its preparation would not have been possible without major assistance from many sources and many people.

To the University of Denver, which granted me a leave of absence as Chancellor for the Academic year 1966-1967, I am eternally grateful. Had this leave not been offered, I could not have undertaken this pleasant assignment.

The Academy officers and staff have provided all assistance and support that was needed. Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President, and Mr. Sidney G. Tickton, Vice President and Treasurer, who served as Study Director, both have been constant sources of advice and guidance. Miss Nancy Berve, Coordinator of Reports, and Mrs. Robert B. Jones, secretary, have done the innumerable things that I could not possibly do and they have done them with complete graciousness and expertness.

Dr. David L. Mosconi, Head of the Division of Research in the University of Denver's College of Business Administration, served as Associate Study Director to coordinate the field work carried on by numerous consultants, and to him and them I extend my special thanks for the immense task of data collection, collation, and interpretation of the materials for the 108 institutions in the sample.

A special note of thanks is due Mr. Curtis Barker, University Relations Officer of the Agency for International Development, who has served as the contract monitor. Although he is in no way responsible for any views expressed in this report, he contributed in a most cooperative and helpful way to the author's understanding and appreciation of the significance of this study.

To all of these I express my appreciation and absolve them of any responsibility for the contents of the study.

Chester M. Alter

April 1967

PART I—CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

Introduction

Since the beginning of the huge buildup of university-government agency relationships shortly after World War II, perhaps no problem has been more frustrating than the proper selection of university contractors. Obviously this is a matter of concern to the contracting agency which has the responsibility not only of defining the project but also the responsibility for the selection of the contractor which is calculated to perform best under the contract. The agency here is confronted with a wide variety of alternatives and may well be subjected to a diversity of pressures from several sources.

By the same token the potential university contractors are under manifold pressures under the guise of internal desires or oppositions from individual faculty members, of taxpayer concern, of prestige-seeking forces, of traditional interests in all kinds of public affairs, and of a developing experience with government contracts.

The selection of a particular university for the awarding of a contract to perform a given mission, however, produces a kind of additional dilemma. On the one hand, it is not unreasonable to expect the agency to want to contract with a university which it believes to be best qualified to perform with excellence; on the other hand, there is a general understanding that every kind of government-university relationship—be it grant, contract, consultation, or what—should be considered an opportunity for the government to undergird and enhance the strength of the university and hence the total strength of the nation's higher educational establishment. The reconciliation of these two avowed purposes, both of which have been implicitly and explicitly avowed by Congress, by the President of the United States, and by educational leaders, points up the desirability of the agency having well-understood criteria for the selection of contracting universities.

In dealing with this subject John W. Gardner wrote:*

> "We have already made the point that A.I.D. should regard every contract as a means of strengthening the university as well as accomplishing a job abroad. So it must not only ask, 'Can this university do the job?' but, 'Are there particular advantages to the national interest in strengthening this university as a future resource?' "

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities,* page 21.

This point of view has been fortified in more recent months by presidential statements as well as by Congressional actions. The enactment of the International Education Act as well as the language of Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 both bear on this matter although there are clear distinctions between the specific objectives of these two pieces of legislation.

However, acceptance of both of these basic objectives might well be useful to the Agency for International Development in deciding between two potential university contractors (institutions A and B are both judged to be able to "do the job" but B would probably *gain* more than A in overall strength because A is already stronger than B; hence, university B possibly is awarded the contract). This does not become a real problem when it is faced from the beginning. There may be a dozen institutions that feel they are able to "do the job" and an analysis of the matter leads to the conclusion that probably at least a half a dozen of them are qualified. What criteria can then be used for selection? Shall the final selection bring about a further refinement of the question of which of the six can *best* "do the job" or of a determination of which of the six would profit most in terms of the development of its strength as a future national resource?

Assuming that in many cases AID contracts are a means of enhancing the strength of a university, we find ourselves asking the question "should (by the selection process) the strongest be made stronger and the weaker remain still adequate but less strong than the strongest, or should the contract be used to upgrade the total base of strength?" This is a policy question which every government agency must resolve for itself if it is not resolved in the national interest by higher authority.

One thing is certain, the dilemma is too important to be resolved by chance or by a series of chances, or by habit, or by a limited knowledge of the total reservoir of potential contractors extending even to the fine structure of a wide variety of colleges and universities.

One of the purposes of this study is to detail the generalized questions raised by John Gardner entitled Selection Criteria.* These eight criteria are as follows:

1. To what extent has the university developed its resources in the international field generally—faculty, curriculum, research, library, interdisciplinary programs?

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities,* 1964, page 22-23.

2. What is the caliber of the faculty in key fields? Relevant fields will of course vary with the nature of the contract and may include—among others—agriculture, economics public administration, medicine, nursing, public health, sociology, cultural anthropology, business administration, education and all fields of engineering.

3. Has the faculty shown any inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work so essential to development assistance? Are there area study programs or interdisciplinary research teams?

4. What are the research resources of the university in fields relevant to development?, and particularly in those fields relating to the problem at hand?

5. Has the university set itself up administratively to handle overseas projects? Do these administrative arrangements have adequate roots at the faculty and departmental level, on the one hand, and adequate top-level backing on the other?

6. Has the university (or the part of the university most directly involved in the contract) had relevant earlier experience in overseas work? How much experience, and what was the quality of its performance?

7. What is the quality of personnel assigned to this specific project? Has the university (and its departments) made it possible for faculty members to participate without suffering in terms of career advancement?

8. What is the degree of the university's commitment to the project? This is not merely a matter of the university's saying, "We're terribly interested." Its commitment can be partly measured by judging the extent to which it has already developed its resources in the international field generally and in the fields relevant to the specific contract. Its future intentions should be explored in some detail. What will it do to strengthen its resources further as the contract proceeds? How does it plan to integrate the overseas project with its home-base operations? What arrangements will it make to insure feedback from field experience into curriculum and research on the campus?

In December, 1965, the Academy for Educational Development entered into a contract with the Agency for International Development to develop and carry out a study designed to ". . . assist A.I.D. to implement the recommendations in the report to the Administrator entitled *A.I.D. and the Universities* by John W. Gardner, dated April 1964 . . . with specific regard for the recommendations on selection of contractors and the development and use of instrumentalities to serve multiple university efforts."

Section I-B of this contract gave the following specific statement of work:

> "1. Within the framework of the Gardner Report, the Contractor will describe a set of detailed criteria and techniques for A.I.D. to use in selecting university contractors. The criteria will, among other things, identify the types of university resources which are relevent to A.I.D.'s needs and the factors which in-

> fluence a university's ability to bring such resources to bear on A.I.D. tasks. Development of the criteria will start from the generalized questions stated in the portion of the Gardner Report entitled "Selection Criteria." The Contractor will detail these criteria.
>
> "2. The Contractor will test these criteria and techniques on the several specific types of United States universities to be chosen by the Contractor. It is understood that the Contractor will be adding to, refining, and defining more precisely, the criteria and techniques while the studies of specific universities are being carried out, and each study of a university will specifically indicate in what way, if any, it is based on criteria or techniques that differ from those finally recommended to A.I.D. In choosing the universities to be studied, the Contractor will seek diversification in size, sponsorship (public, private, sectarian, nonsectarian), experience in international operations, experience with A.I.D. or predecessor agencies, geographic distribution in the United States, geographic and functional areas of overseas interest, and such other factors as may be relevant in obtaining a representative group with sufficient diversity to test and illustrate the application of proper criteria and techniques. The group will include at least 100 universities, and no more than 125 universities, unless otherwise agreed upon by A.I.D. Consultants may be engaged for studies of specific universities, subject to appropriate safeguards against possible conflicts of interest, but responsibility for each study and for the correlation of the studies rests with the Contractor.
>
> "3. Starting from the section of the Gardner Report entitled "Non-governmental Arrangements," the Contractor will describe in detail and recommend, with criteria for choice, what kinds of instrumentalities are needed, are practicable, and will most effectively serve to promote multiple-university efforts in A.I.D. programs.
>
> "4. In performing the contract, the Contractor will assemble and analyze all available data, including information available within and outside A.I.D.; make visits and on the scene surveys, as appropriate; assess the relevant characteristics of each institution, with particular regard for the Gardner recommendations; and maintain a close working relationship with A.I.D."

This task has been undertaken with full cognizance of the warning given by Mr. Gardner as follows:

> "It has been suggested that we correct the deficiencies of recent selection procedures by establishing an orderly, systematic and explicit set of procedures and criteria. But we believe that any such attempt to formalize or explicitly define the selection procedure would tie the Agency hand and foot."

We subscribe to and have tried to adhere to this advice. But Mr. Gardner continued:

> "The solution to the selection problem is to state certain general considerations (as we have above) and then to make certain that the people doing the selection are adequately equipped to do an intelligent job. This means, first of all, that they must be people who *know* the universities and know quality when they

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities*, page 22-23.

> see it. The second requirement is that they have a thorough grasp of the nature of the job to be done overseas. The third requirement is that they have access to (or develop on their own) a comprehensive view of the *total U. S. resources* (university and other) to do the job. The fourth requirement is that there be instrumentalities (such as . . . university consortia) through which the resources of small institutions can be tapped."

It is within the framework of this advice and using the eight general considerations cited by Mr. Gardner that this study undertakes to be helpful to those in the Agency charged with the responsibility of selecting university contractors.

For each of the generalized criteria suggested by Mr. Gardner, some general elaborations and interpretations are included. Some, from a practical and operational point of view, are more realistic than others. The objective facts are applicable and available for some of his criteria, whereas for others the Agency will probably have to be content with subjective judgments. In the latter case, however, such judgments should be based on at least sophisticated and enlightened feelings of people who are well acquainted with the needs of the Agency and the detailed nature of the American educational system.

First, we have detailed Mr. Gardner's generalized questions by applying them to the various types of institutions and consortia. Second, we have tested many of the criteria through review of a vast amount of information and data as well as by means of personal interviews with knowledgeable people, always keeping in mind that in order to get pertinent and relevant answers prior to making a decision (such as selection of a contractor), the right and relevant questions must be asked. The right question to ask of one type of institution may be irrelevant in the case of another type.

For the purpose of this study we have used the nine rather obvious types or categories of institutions or organizations into which the 108 examples in the sample were divided. (see Appendix A, page 71). The number of sample institutions in the ninth, or "other" category is so small, and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally. (In Mr. Gardner's generalized questions he used the word "university" to include all kinds of higher education institutions—universities, colleges, junior colleges, consortia, etc.)

For the purpose of detailing Mr. Gardner's generalized selection criteria and for the purpose of testing these against various types of institutions within the sample, we devised rather specific questions which could be asked of each university. These questions were not of equal significance with respect to either (a) the extent to which good answers were available for all institutions, or (b) their value in helping the Agency answer the crucial question of whether or not a specific institution would be a good place to consider for a development contract.

The questions, however, were helpful as a technique which any agency, not thoroughly knowledgeable about each of a long list of institutions, would find useful in building up an inventory of information about the probable resources and attitudes in individual institutions. The questions should be useful in giving a background of something more than purely subjective feelings about the potential usefulness of the various types of institutions for the meeting of AID's needs.

It is on the basis of our experience in this testing program, as well as from discussions with many experienced educators (both faculty and administrators), that we have been able to arrive at the general comments following a statement of each of Mr. Gardner's eight generalized "Selection Criteria" applied to each of the nine categories or types of institutions. Many of the specific questions actually shed light on more than one criterion.

The specific questions, based on those raised by the Academy's representatives in studying the various sample institutions, are as follows:

1. What information on the various departments and schools in your institutions do you have that might be helpful to the administrators of the AID program?
2. Can you provide AID with the names of department chairmen and faculty members who might be particularly helpful to the AID program?
3. Can you provide the number of graduate students in the particular departments and schools involved?
4. Can you provide the number of master's degrees awarded for the past five years?
5. Can you provide the number of doctoral degrees awarded for the past five years?
6. What information on the various departments and schools can you provide for the last five years showing the research and other important contracts and grants conducted by your institution?
7. Can you provide information for the last five years showing the research, consulting, government, and corporate activities in which key faculty members were involved?

8. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of publications by the faculty for each of the past five years?
9. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of overseas activities of the faculty for the past five years?
10. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of honors received by the faculty for the past five years?
11. Can you provide a list of non-Western courses and programs offered by your institution?
12. Can you provide AID with the enrollment in each of these programs at the graduate level?
13. Can you provide information on special research institutes on campus?
14. Can you provide information on research activities in affiliated hospitals?
15. Can you provide information on off-campus research centers and laboratories?
16. What information can you provide on your institution's commitment to overseas development work?
17. Does your institution have a flexibility of operation which will make it possible to undertake new assignments, particularly off-campus and overseas?
18. Is your institution in a position to tailor programs to the needs of developing countries?
19. Could your institution release some of its best personnel to spend a year or two abroad?
20. How would the administration replace these persons or reassign their current duties?
21. What kinds of educational development activities has your institution carried on in recent years, both domestically and overseas?
22. Do you have any unique programs or have you made special contributions to the development of your local community?
23. Who in the institution has been responsible for these programs?
24. Are these programs still being carried on?
25. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in such activities as the Peace Corps?
26. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in such activities as the Job Corps?
27. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in other domestic programs involving the underprivileged?
28. Has your institution been involved in programs such as these in its own community or in nearby areas?
29. Does your institution include foreign students in its student body?
30. How many foreign students were on campus during each of the past five years?
31. From which countries do they originate?

32. What special activities does the institution engage in with respect to foreign students?

33. What does your institution do in order to understand better the needs of foreign students, and to overcome some of the problems they present?

34. What special resources or programs does your institution have that you think might be helpful to the AID program?

35. Does your institution have a museum, a library, and anthropological and archaeological specialities and interests?

36. What kind of adult education and extension services does your institution conduct?

37. What is the scope of these activities?

38. Are there special language programs and institutes on your campus?

39. Does your institution have a foreign study program such as junior year abroad or a foreign center?

40. Is your institution engaged in cooperative activities with other colleges and universities?

41. Is your institution engaged in cooperative activities with secondary schools?

42. If your institution is engaged in cooperative activities with other colleges, universities, or secondary schools, can you provide descriptive information which AID might find useful?

43. Can you provide printed or other descriptive material issued by the institution, such as catalogs, annual reports, presidents' reports, and press releases, which might be helpful in assessing the scope and the range of your institution's activities?

44. Can you provide printed or other descriptive material issued by the institution which would be helpful in explaining the aims and capacities of your institution to members of the staff directing and planning the AID program?

Page Index to Gardner Criteria by Type of Institution

CRITERIA Type of Institution	Extent of Resources†	Caliber of Faculty	Interdisc. Programs	Research Resources	Administ. Capability	Overseas Experience	Quality of Personnel	Institutional Commitment
Land * Grant	Page 10	Page 16	Page 20	Page 26	Page 30	Page 35	Page 39	Page 43
Other-Public	10	16	21	26	31	35	39	44
Public Branches	11	17	21	27	31	35	40	45
Large Private	12	17	22	27	32	36	40	45
Liberal Arts	12	18	23	27	33	36	41	46
Large Engineer.	13	18	23	28	33	37	41	46
Junior Colleges	14	19	24	28	34	37	42	47
Consortia	15	19	24	29	34	37	42	47

***Fuller definitions of these categories appear in Appendix A, page 71.**

†Fuller explanations of these criteria appear on page 2.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 1

"To what extent has the university developed its resources in the international field generally —faculty, curriculum, research, library, interdisciplinary programs?"

Land-Grant Universities

This type of institution can be said to have developed its resources in the international field to a high degree and this has been done in most cases in a relatively short period of time. However, it should be noted that this rapid development in the land-grant university has not necessarily been of an across-the-board kind. For instance, the evidence would indicate that such institutions have strengthened their international interests in applied areas such as agriculture and engineering perhaps to a greater extent than they have in areas such as languages, anthropology, sociology, and the several cultural fields.

In a similar manner, in this type of institution perhaps more attention has been given to the operation, administration, management, and staffing of overseas development projects than in developing a planned way interdisciplinary area study programs at the undergraduate and graduate level or in the development of broadly-conceived curricula in, for instance, non-Western studies.

It appears that the annual dollar volume of overseas development work in some land-grant universities exceeds the total dollar volume of all research on their home campus. In the land-grant universities, development of resources of future importance in international development generally has not been undertaken in certain professional areas. For instance, law, international relations, education, social work, and business administration are not usually as well developed in land-grant institutions as they are in other types of institutions. In engineering there appears to be a wide variation of stages of development within this type of institution.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The general development of the public universities, in terms of this criterion, is at high level and reflects historically a longer period of interest in international affairs than has been the case with the land-grant institutions. They may be considered together with the latter type as constituting almost the full gamut of American higher education at the university level. To be sure, the public non-land-grant institutions generally have not been assigned certain fields of interest to the Agency such as agriculture, but, on the other hand, they generally have well-developed professional programs in medicine and law which may well be of future importance in international development. In terms of general resources such as arts and sciences and including engineering, out of which an interest in overseas work might be expected to flourish, these institutions are strong. Area study curricula, including non-Western cultural programs, are quite generally found. Language instruction, including many of those languages identified with less-developed nations, is common in the large public universities.

Faculties are large, diversified, and are oriented toward research and scholarship in many of the more prominent public institutions. The libraries of many of these institutions are among the better university libraries of the United States.

It should be pointed out that many of the large public universities have attracted large numbers of foreign students and visiting scholars and, particularly in more recent years, have found it possible to send more faculty members on a wide variety of overseas study and research assignments.

Public University Branches

It has been observed that this category of institutions, which is of rather recent origin, usually has not developed resources in the international field to the extent the parent universities have.* This is understandable because, in general, these branches have been established in large population centers primarily to meet the basic educational needs of the residents under the theory that it is cheaper to provide educational facilities where the people live than to transport students to a central-state university campus.

In many of the branch campuses, it is probable that the emphasis is on teaching and training rather than on research. In many, part-time and adult education is of major importance. Libraries in many of the branches are inferior to those in the parent university, although interlibrary mechanisms may be in operation. Team approaches and interdisciplinary curricula are less well developed than in the parent institution.

In some cases, the administrative relations between the parent and branch are unclear, both at the higher echelons and at the departmental level. Local autonomy and legal authority for entering into contracts vary from case to case.

---

* There are a few exceptions to this general statement.

Large Private Universities

With perhaps the exception of agriculture and, to a lesser extent, adult education, trade skills, or vocational training, the large private universities have generally (with some specific exceptions) had considerable experience with and interest in international fields. This is natural because they are not supported by the various states and therefore have considered themselves more nationally and internationally oriented. It should be pointed out that there is a wide variation between the representatives of this category of universities in terms of size, scope and emphasis of curricula, international interest, and their views of their own educational mission, as well as their source of control.

Many of the large private universities have traditionally had a substantial interest in foreign students and in the development of working relationships with foreign universities. Area studies programs, interdisciplinary curricula, and the development of cross-professional and disciplinary institutes are common in the large private universities. On many of these campuses, research, not only in the sciences and engineering but also in the basic and applied social sciences, is found to be a significant mission.

Some of the best qualified private universities, from the standpoint of this criterion, may tend to see direct service to the government or to specific overseas undertakings as falling outside their own objectives.

Purely from the standpoint of this criterion alone, it can be said that many of the large private universities represent a fine resource for international development programs. However, the variation between the individual institutions within this category is so great and the needs of the Agency's projects are so specific that the possible matching of university to project becomes a problem requiring considerable understanding.

Nevertheless, this category of institutions represents a great store of potential usefulness simply from the point of view of extent of development of resources in the international field.

Liberal Arts Colleges

As a practical matter, the limited scope of purpose of this type of institution has had the effect of limiting their development of resources (particularly those needed by the Agency) in the international field. This is not to say that these colleges are not interested in international affairs. Many of them have developed strong interdisciplinary and intercultural area-study and non-Western studies programs at the undergraduate level. Their faculties may well include individuals who are most competent in applicable disciplines. Generally, however, they are oriented to undergraduate teaching. The depth of manpower in a given field is usually such that mobility of assignment would not be great, and research, particularly on broad interdisciplinary problems, is usually absent. The service mission of the liberal arts college is less well developed than in other types of educational institutions.

Libraries generally service the undergraduate teaching mission rather than any broader purpose. Many of the colleges have, for their size, a substantial foreign student population.

There is some indication that many of the better liberal arts colleges are beginning to feel the need of greater involvement in action programs including possibly international development. Many are establishing some kind of overseas branch operation or cooperative overseas study opportunities for their own students.

The lack of depth (in terms of numbers) of faculty in a given discipline, as mentioned above, is leading to an increasing interest among liberal arts colleges in the formation of cooperative interinstitutional associations, consortia, etc., for the purpose of reinforcing their strengths in fields of interest to the Agency.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Although this category of institutions is not large, there are several examples which have developed substantial and important resources applicable to the Agency's needs. Many of these institutions are already involved in AID contracts and in other overseas development programs under other auspices.

Naturally, as the name of this type of institution implies, the scope of disciplines involved is more limited than in the case of other categories, but in several of the institutions their resources are more extensive than would be anticipated. For instance, there are cases of technological institutes which recently have developed strong interests and capabilities in management, administration, and economics. Furthermore, some have made substantial contributions to the application of these interests to overseas development.

The variation in size of these institutions leads to considerable disparity in their specific resources, both in terms of departmental depth and in terms of interdisciplinary scope and capability. It is found that, within this category, generally the most important resources will be the various branches of engineering. Particular attention is called to their experience in the application of this discipline to broad problems of industrial development. Usually these institutions would have had less experience in small, grass roots, trade, or simple commercial or manufacturing development, but there are undoubtedly exceptions.

If concern for the development of overseas research centers is applicable, this category of American institutions could provide significant resources.

As a rule these institutions have not developed wide-scale programs that we have come to know as area studies, nor are highly developed non-Western cultural undertakings found in their curricula, either at the undergraduate or graduate level.

A remarkably high enrollment of foreign students, particularly at the graduate level, exists in this category of institutions reflecting a basic interest in what they have to offer other countries.

Because most of these institutions are private, they are expected to be less locally-oriented in their activities than would be the case if they were state-supported. On the other hand, a few of them have, sometimes through an almost autonomous division, developed strong technical and vocational programs designed to meet local manpower needs. This might well constitute a valuable resource useful to overseas development, notwithstanding the fact that these two objectives might seem incompatible.

The great disparity between the different representatives of this category of institutions, in terms of objectives, size, mode of operation, and even basic strength, leads to the conclusion that this criterion, although highly pertinent, would have to be applied to the individual institution rather than to the class on the whole in order to determine its true validity.

Junior Colleges

In view of the basic objectives, location, source of control and support, and in terms of scope of their mission (many junior colleges are actually called community colleges), these institutions are not expected to have developed many resources in the international field. Although this is generally true, it is possible that a given junior college or several of them combined would have certain kinds of resources that might be matched with AID's needs in specific specialized projects. In fact, they might have some resources and "know-how" which would be superior to any of the other types of institutions.

An agency or foundation would not go to the typical junior college if the project involved a high degree of sophisticated strength in any one of the usual substantive disciplines or professions. Teaching on the undergraduate level is their prime function. Research is usually not emphasized if carried on at all. Library facilities are developed to meet the college's teaching needs and, in most cases, would be rather inadequate for research support. Teaching loads are generally high relative to other types of institutions. Interdisciplinary programs or curricula which normally involve upper-class and graduate students are ordinarily not present in the junior college.

However, many junior and community colleges have had excellent experience in certain areas which might put them in the position of serving as an important resource in support of selected AID projects, provided of course that some of the other criteria are positive. Two possibilities are cited:

- Trade school or vocational programs. Many of the junior or community colleges have developed strong trade, subprofessional, or vocational programs usually related to the specific manpower needs of their local community. This is a unique kind of educational or, more often, training operation with which, generally speaking, the other types of institutions have had relatively little experience. Although most junior colleges do not have staff or faculty members who have had a diversity of experience in international development, it is altogether likely that some really good teachers of the various trades and subprofessional skills (such as clerical, electronics, mechanics, etc.) could best be found in the junior college.
- Administration of grass roots or locally oriented trade-skill or vocational institutions. The very nature of the mission of the junior or community college as it has developed in the United States (although they vary widely in scope, structure, support, and control) has given rise to a substantial body of experienced administrators skilled in the organization, development, and management of this increasingly important type of educational institution. Here again the typical junior college administrator is not experienced in overseas development for the most part or in the application of his knowledge and experience to the overseas developing nation problem.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since consortia do not generally have faculties, curricula, libraries, etc., this criterion does not specifically apply. But the consortia do draw upon the resources of their component institutions. The major question is the extent to which these resources are made available to the consortium itself. There is a wide disparity among consortia in the degree of availability or usefulness of member resources. Geographic proximity of the members to each other, institutional interest in the joint undertaking, rightness and prestige of the consortium administration and management are all factors which may well determine the degree to which the resources of the components are marshalled in support of the needs of the consortium in relation to its mission.

For further material on consortia, see Part II, page 49.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 2

"What is the caliber of faculty *in key fields? Relevant fields will of course vary with the nature of the contract and may include—among others—agriculture, economics public administration, medicine, nursing, public health, sociology, cultural anthropology, business administration, education and all fields of engineering."*

Land-Grant Universities

A high quality of faculty is normally found in this category of institutions, both in terms of the traditional standards used to measure quality and in terms of depth of backup strength (quantity). However, it must be remembered that this is a group of universities that traditionally has been assigned a somewhat limited educational mission. For instance, all of the land-grant institutions would be expected to have well-developed programs and faculties in agriculture, but few would have medical or dental schools. By the same token, the basic arts and sciences usually, but not in all cases, have been considered service courses in these institutions and the great strength in faculty that has been developed in some other categories of universities normally would not be found.

Therefore, this criterion becomes highly important when considering a particular land-grant institution for an Agency contract and the conclusions would be affected by the nature of the particular field or fields relevant to the specific project.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

Since this category of institutions includes both the large multipurpose and general state universities as well as the state colleges (the latter often being institutions which until recently were teacher colleges but are now rapidly expanding to include other fields, particularly arts and sciences), wide variation in caliber of faculty will be found in the fields relevant to international development projects. Most of these schools would not include agriculture and many would not include engineering. Many of our finest medical schools and schools of public health are found in this type of university. Many of these institutions (both universities and state colleges) have particularly fine programs and high caliber faculty in the field of education, including primary, secondary and higher education.

Here again the application of this criterion to this category of institutions has to be made on an individual basis, both with respect to the specific project and to the particular institution under consideration.

Public University Branches

There is a general feeling that the caliber of faculty, in most of the fields relevant to international development, would not be as high in university branches as that in their parent institutions. The evidence seems to confirm this feeling, although there are a few specific exceptions.

An important question to ask in considering a branch university is whether or not the branch is fully integrated with the parent at the departmental level or is the relationship primarily at the administrative level. This relationship seems to be particularly important in the application of this criterion. Generally the quality appears higher and certainly the potential depth of expertness would be greater in the cases where there is close integration (perhaps under one chairman) of faculty and curriculum at the department level.

Since most branches of the state universities are located in large population centers, their branches in terms of faculty and curricula could be expected to be more closely related to local community manpower needs. This fact in itself could give rise to the possibility in specific cases of finding high quality faculty in certain relevant fields.

Large Private Universities

The caliber of faculty in key fields will be found high in a large number of large private universities. This category of institutions, in most cases, will also provide high quality of faculty in substantial depth in many relevant areas. But by the same token this category will be void of some key fields. For instance, the broad field of agriculture is practically untouched in the private university with the possible exception of agricultural economics and certain scientific areas where applications are made to agricultural problems (for example, entomology).

There is usually great strength in the relevant basic arts and sciences and in many of the professions (law, medicine, engineering, public health [in perhaps fewer cases], education, and nursing).

Although great strength of faculty in key fields is often found in this category of institutions, many are more oriented toward undergraduate and graduate teaching, basic research, and scholarly rather than in service types of activity. There are, however, significant exceptions to this, and the trend appears to be towards more involvement of expert faculty members in this type of non-public institution in applied and project research, consultation with industry and government, and towards team approaches to problem solving.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Since this category of institutions is highly limited in scope of interest, it is obvious that many areas applicable to international development would be missing entirely. This would include all the professions. Since the majority of these colleges are concerned with only undergraduate curricula and are relatively small, the depth of strength in the faculty would not be found very great. Excellent people, particularly in the arts and sciences, are, however, present on these campuses, and a high degree of interest in interdisciplinary approaches is found, as reflected in their curricula, and this applies specifically to area-studies programs and non-Western cultures and languages. Research and action programs related to the requirements of international studies generally are not well developed on the liberal arts college campus.

This criterion is difficult to apply to this category of institutions simply because their total interest and qualifications would not lead them into a potential for Agency contracts. The high quality of the faculties, however, is a resource which should not be overlooked when teams under different management auspices are being established.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

This criterion must be applied with care and discernment to this category of institutions because of the variations in the nature of their objectives and scope, and in the apparent variations in the general quality of faculty from institution to institution within the category.

High quality of faculty can be expected in many of the basic sciences and in certain branches of engineering, but there again there is a high degree of specificity. Few of these institutions would have high quality and depth in hydraulic engineering as applied to irrigation problems, but a small number would. Some of those that have great strength in this field might be weak in language capabilities or in other relevant and related fields.

Strong programs in agriculture, medicine, nursing, cultural anthropology, teacher education, and business administration usually would not be found in this category of institutions, although a few have developed strong management and industrial administration programs with the highest quality of faculty.

Junior Colleges

When an attempt is made to apply this general criterion to most junior colleges, it will be found that, by using solely the traditional academic standards, the response would be generally unfavorable. The doctoral degree is assumed to be important in describing faculty quality, and in most cases the percentage of doctorates on junior college faculties is lower than in several of the other categories. Ordinarily, in the relevant fields cited by Mr. Gardner, the quality of faculty in many junior colleges would not be considered high.

On the other hand, other fields may turn out to be most relevant to specific AID projects and in such cases there might very well be found a very high quality faculty. This would be particularly true in the fields of trade skills, subprofessional areas, and vocational education. Therefore, if the Agency were involved in a project calling for the development of instruction and training in fields such as industrial arts, metal working, carpentry, or sewing, it would undoubtedly discover a higher quality of faculty in certain junior colleges than it would in the typical university or liberal arts college.

By the same token, a high degree of interdisciplinary sophistication probably would not be found in the typical junior college. Naturally there are individual exceptions on many junior college campuses, and these individuals might in some cases be a useful and effective resource.

For the purpose of marshalling enough over-all strength to warrant a total institutional contract, many junior colleges would be found lacking.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since the typical consortium or association does not have a faculty of its own, obviously this criterion does not apply to this category.

However, since consortia do draw upon the member institutions, it is at least conceivable that the quality of faculty involved in a given project managed through a consortium might be very high. At least the potential for this kind of result would be present. The criterion should be applied in every case, however, because there is always the possibility of the opposite result occurring—namely, the aggregation of less able and therefore most readily assigned faculty from several members of the consortia being allocated to the group for overseas assignment.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 3

> ***"Has the faculty shown any inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work so essential to development assistance? Are there area study programs or interdisciplinary research teams?"***

Land-Grant Universities

Because of the traditional service mission of the land-grant colleges and universities, the use of the interdisciplinary approach to problem solving has been quite common in this type of institution.

It is noteworthy, however, that what mght be called interdisciplinary work by the people in this type of institution would probably mean something entirely different from what the same expression would describe in, say, a private college or university. In the former, it might mean an irrigation engineer, a fertilizer chemist, a soil expert, and a farm economist, all attacking a problem of creating a viable and productive agricultural district in a developing country. In the latter, the same expression might mean a cultural anthropologist, a sociologist, a political scientist, two or three language scholars, and a historian combining to study the effect of modern methods of communication on the social and cultural behavior of a tribe or nation.

Area study curricula in the usual sense have not been widely developed in most of the land-grant institutions. More often interdisciplinary research teams are at work, although, as pointed out above, even in research such teams may be somewhat restricted in disciplinary scope. With the recent growth patterns of the land-grant institutions in many states and with the general tendency for them to move more in the direction of becoming all-purpose universities, particularly building more strength in the basic sciences, the arts and humanities, and even in many cases the addition of new professional schools (for instance, business administration), an increase can be expected in the tendency to use interdisciplinary research teams and to develop broader area curricular programs.

This criterion needs to be applied to this category of institutions, but caution also is called for in its use as a measure of future contract success. The required interdisciplinary approach for a needed project may involve different areas and certainly different people than past team efforts have required, so experience may not be specifically applicable. The right attitude or general faculty and administration's feeling regarding this kind of work so necessary to development assistance would likely be found present in this category of institutions.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

This category of institutions has been in the forefront of the development of interdisciplinary programs, both from the standpoint of team research and in area studies curricula. For instance, the involvement of a university in the development of a Latin American area study program with substantial interinstitutional relationships with Central and South American institutions was first developed in a state university. Such cooperative programs have spread widely among this category of institutions, particularly with the state universities. The state colleges, being more limited in scope of interest, have not advanced as far in this kind of activity, but a number are making initial efforts in this direction.

This criterion should be applied in the consideration of an institution of this type and especially in view of the following observation. Although these institutions are generally large and diversified in their resources, evidence is developing that some may be so large that it has become necessary for the separate internal units (departments, divisions, schools, colleges, etc.) to become large enough themselves to gain autonomy and self-sufficiency, and in some cases to be rather noncommunicative with other units. A scholar in a departmental faculty of one hundred may find it possible, if not usual, to discover that all or most of his casual acquaintances, even daily luncheon companions, are all from his own department. Similarly many of the academic disciplines are so broad that sub-specialties are developed to an extent that a specialist in economic theory who joins with an economic statistician on a project might say he was engaged in interdisciplinary research.

The comments regarding the application of this criterion to land-grant institutions are applicable also to this category of institutions.

Public University Branches

It is safe to say that the interdisciplinary approach either in curriculum development or in team research has not been developed widely in the branch operations of most public universities. Naturally there may be a few exceptions. This general observation could be expected to be true because of the dominance of undergraduate and adult education programs in the branches, the fact that most of the branches are relatively recent on the educational scene, and the fact that most of them are directed primarily toward local community needs.

It is quite possible, however, that individual faculty members might be found on these campuses who are interested in, capable of, or are actually engaged in cooperative interdisciplinary team efforts.

One question that can be raised when considering a representative of this category of institutions is the extent to which it is integrated with its parent university, particularly at the departmental or academic faculty level.

Large Private Universities

The faculty and administrative inclinations toward and patterns of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and research in the large private universities appear to be more similar to those found in the large public universities than to those in the typical land-grant institutions. Area-studies programs and regional institutes (such as Far East, Southeast Asia, African, and Latin American) are often found in these universities. These programs and institutes in some cases involve undergraduate instruction as well as graduate instruction and research. A question arises, however, as to whether the interdisciplinary approach is really a pervading fact or is it a paper objective announced in principle but not strongly adhered to in practice? A great divergence will be found between different universities and sometimes great differences in the degree to which the approach is actually used in various areas of the same university. Some of the strongest and best developed area-study programs in the higher education establishment are found in the private universities, and some of these have now had several decades of experience, although the majority have developed their programs since World War II.

It has been observed that a greater prevalence of formally organized graduate schools of international relations (most of which are oriented toward political affairs and foreign policy) is found in the private universities than in the public institutions. Although foreign policy and international political science is not an area in which the Agency would likely be primarily interested for the purpose of enhancing international development, it is obvious that the presence of such an undertaking on a campus might well be an indication of broad institutional interest in overseas studies. There is on campuses where international relations (in the traditional sense) is a well-developed operation a rather widespread flavor of international concern diffusing the whole institution.

The broad-based objectives of the recently-enacted International Education Act, calling for the development of centers of excellence in this field, may well focus a considerable amount of additional attention around the already functioning graduate schools of international studies. It may also encourage these schools, so often found in the private universities, to develop wider based attacks on problems involving more disciplines than have been usual.

Generally speaking, one would expect this criterion to be as well met in this category of institutions as in any other and better than in several.

Liberal Arts Colleges

This criterion is particularly applicable to the typical liberal arts college, but in a way entirely different from its pertinence to the usual land-grant, public, or private university. Naturally as these colleges are primarily, if not solely (a few do offer some graduate work at the master's degree level in a few fields), restricted to undergraduate teaching with little interest in research, their interest or inclination is to apply the interdisciplinary approach to curricular matters. Team teaching has been developed on many of these campuses. This is perhaps due to what is said to be a "demand" on the part of the current generation of students, particularly students of the arts and sciences, that all their courses if not every lecture and every problem assigned be "relevant" to the great social problems of the day. This growing attitude of students is often shared by an increasing (or at least an increasingly vocal minority) number of faculty members.

This inclination toward a broader approach to learning has been manifested in a fairly large number of liberal arts colleges through their overseas center or junior year abroad programs. Dozens of relatively small colleges have established or acquired a foreign facility (most often in Western Europe) for housing groups of their students for a semester or year of study either under the guidance of their own assigned faculty members or in a foreign university. Such programs do indicate a growing interest in the interdisciplinary approach as related to overseas culture although seldom are these located in or related to the underdeveloped or developing regions of primary interest to the Agency.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Strange as it may seem, in view of the fact that the traditional image of this type of institution is one reflecting a high degree of specialization, there are several examples within the category where a well-developed philosophy of team research and interdisciplinary curricula exists. These examples of such unexpected inclinations are, however, likely to be more narrow than those found on general-purpose university campuses. For instance, at an institute well-developed teams might be actively engaged in a broad scope engineering project, but utilizing some basic scientists such as chemists, physicists, and mathematicians. The broad scope curricula commonly referred to as regional area studies (such as Far Eastern, African, or Latin American) involving language, politics, history, geography, anthropology, and sociology are not likely to be found here.

It is interesting to note that in several of this type of institution there are very recent trends toward affiliation, or actual merger in two very recent cases, of science and engineering institutions with other institutions with a broader base of programs to some extent for the purpose of making possible a greater degree of potential interdisciplinary work. Common involvement of this type of institution in consortia either for a single project or for a joint attack on several undertakings would also indicate a desire on the part of their faculties to provide a wider base of potential interdisciplinary knowledge and expertness which can be brought to bear on the process of solving problems.

Junior Colleges

Because of the dominant emphasis on lower division work (freshman and sophomore) in the arts and sciences with a second emphasis on trade skills and subprofessional areas, the faculties of most junior colleges have not shown a great inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work which Mr. Gardner deems "so essential to development assistance." Few junior colleges have developed what are considered significant area-study programs or interdisciplinary research teams. If, to be sure, such a criteria were deemed essential or even desirable for a specific development project overseas, it would not be profitable to explore the possibility of a junior college to handle the contract.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

This criterion is not specifically applicable to consortia since it deals with the habitual or philosophical stance of an institutional faculty.

In the case of a single purpose *ad hoc* type of consortium, however, designed primarily to carry out an interdisciplinary kind of project, this criterion would be important. Putting a political scientist from one institution, an engineer from another, an agriculturist from a third, and a sociologist from a fourth into a consortium for the purpose of carrying out a development project abroad will not guarantee an interdisciplinary team approach to the problem at hand. Although the administrator of the contract may be cognizant of the need for a real interdisciplinary attack on the defined problem and each of the specialists may say he is so inclined, there is something rather novel and unpredictable about this kind of work which in the end, if great tact and care are not used, is likely to end up with four separate and unrelated thrusts.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 4

"What are the research resources of the university in fields relevant to development, and particularly in those fields relating to the problem at hand?"

Land-Grant Universities

It can be assumed for this type of university that a specific institution being considered for an overseas development project would have sufficient research resources in those fields relevant to the problem at hand; otherwise the particular university would not be interested in the project. It is safe to say that perhaps the greatest research strength of the land-grant universities now lies in the fields related to agriculture and engineering. However, these institutions have developed specialized strengths peculiar to their own states and regions and their strengths may not match the requirements of the specific overseas problem involved. For instance, research on the technology of irrigation or development of semiarid lands would not likely be found on the campus of an eastern land-grant college. Therefore, in the consideration of a specific university (particularly of the state land-grant type) for a specific project, it is not enough for the university to say, "We have a strong research program." This criterion, if it is important for a given project as it very often will be, therefore must be more specifically applied in the light of the problem at hand.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

In most cases the research resources of the large state universities can be assumed to be strong. This does not mean that they are strong or even adequate resources for support of the problems in all fields relevant to the specific projects of interest to the Agency. In most cases, the total research background of the state colleges included in this category is found to be less than in the public universities. Again there are exceptions particularly in certain fields. Teacher education might well be one of these exceptions.

It is entirely conceivable that for many projects a strong research resource might not be necessary for the contracting institutions. Nevertheless, a demonstrated history of research would be one of the indications of interest, especially if the scholars involved could see the possibility of a significant feedback from the overseas project which could be used to further their own research program.

Although this criterion is of great and general importance, it would appear that it could be applied to a given institution only after the specific project is well formulated.

Public University Branches

From the very history and nature of the public university branches it can be assumed that few of them have as yet developed strong research programs in fields of interest to the Agency. Again, it should be pointed out that in some cases where there is close curricular and departmental relationship between the branch and the parent or central institution, individual faculty members in the branch may actively engage in research projects as a part of the research undertaking of the parent department.

This criterion can be expected to come up with rather negative results when applied to this type of institution. Nevertheless, when such a resource is important to the problem at hand it would be a cogent question to ask.

Large Private Universities

In many of the large private universities the research programs are highly developed and often broad in scope. Naturally a wide disparity is found between institutions in this group with respect to fields of research emphasis. In general, there are many within this category where there has been a tendency toward theoretical or basic research rather than toward the more applied type. Whole areas of research interest and, therefore, research resources normally would be found missing in the private university (for instance, in agriculture).

Many of the private universities have substantially developed the team or interdisciplinary research approach, but again this is variable and might not be found on a given campus in fields of relevance to a specific overseas development project.

Although the fulfillment of this criterion would have a high degree of expectancy in this type of university, it should be necessary to apply it only in the light of the problem at hand.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Since research productivity is not an important objective of the liberal arts college, significant reservoirs of research resources in the fields usually relevant to overseas development

ordinarily would not be found on these campuses. There might be a few exceptions, but they would be indeed few.

Certainly for any project where research experience (and particularly applied research or broad interdisciplinary team research) is a requirement of the problem at hand, it would be reasonable to assume that the liberal arts college would not be adequate to meet the need.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Many of the institutions in this category have developed the highest level of research experience and will therefore be able to provide a strong resource under this criterion. Naturally, again, the criterion will have to be applied on an individual institutional basis in the light of the requirements of the problem or project at hand.

Generally, agricultural research would be found missing at these universities and institutes where both pure and applied research problems usually receive attention. Many are involved in consulting arrangements with government agencies and industry as well as in contract research projects. Necessary laboratory, library, and other research facilities are usually available at such institutions. Because of specialization, it would be necessary to be selective among this group when matching the requirements of the project at hand with the strength of the research resource at a given institution.

Junior Colleges

This general question, for all practical purposes, is not worth asking of the junior college. Research, as the word is commonly used in academic circles, is not prevalent in this type of institution nor do they see scholarly research as an important activity within their total mission.

Here again, if, in a special case, a study of some of the problems of the development or operation of junior or community college programs were needed in support of an Agency project, it is conceivable that one or two such institutions might be competent and interested. The problem of justifying the carrying on of research or otherwise involvement in an overseas mission at a locally-oriented and locally-supported institution is probably more critical with the typical junior college than with other types of institutions.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since a consortium of institutions would not be presumed to have any research resources of its own, the research capabilities which might be utilized could be only those of its members. In some cases, particularly with consortia made up of university-type components, this could be a source of great strength if these resources could in actuality be made available to the consortium. Often, however, geographic proximity to laboratories and research libraries is such a necessity that joint use of research facilities, either by faculty or by graduate students, does not turn out to be very feasible.

Although many institutions offering graduate work have worked out arrangements for cooperative use of specialized research equipment, it has been the usual experience that there are many complicating factors interfering with actual joint participation or joint use of facilities. A graduate student having a morning schedule of classes on one campus finds it difficult to go to another institution for his research work that afternoon. The same problem exists for faculty members.

If a strong and physically integrated research backup strength is an important factor in a specific AID project, it is reasonable to assume that contracting with a consortium might present serious difficulties. Here again, there are exceptions in specialized cases and the applicability of this criterion would have to be determined in the light of the requirements of the problem at hand.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 5

"Has the university set itself up administratively to handle overseas projects? Do these administrative arrangements have adequate roots at the faculty and departmental level, on the one hand, and adequate top-level backing on the other?"

Land-Grant Universities

Most of the land-grant universities have become large enough to have developed administrative strength with sufficient depth and diversity to insure adequate managerial capability both in financial and academic affairs.

In some institutions (or states), there are certain legal restrictions which make it difficult for the institutions themselves to enter into contracts or to receive private grants for special purposes. Many of these institutions have therefore established separate corporations, usually called foundations or institutes, for receiving such funds and for operating and administering some of their contract services. Normally these separate corporate entities come under the same administrative control as the university, but commonly have their own board of trustees or directors. This administrative necessity may, in some of the public institutions, have arisen out of a wide variety of specific causes; for example, state auditing of state appropriated funds requiring special auditing procedures, state rules regarding year-end reserves, state travel regulations, and so forth.

Any outside agency, including a Federal agency, therefore must determine in the case of each specific institution whether it will be negotiating with the university or with a subsidiary organization and, if it is the latter situation, what complications may result.

Many institutions in this category have been involved in so many overseas contracts and programs which encourage both inside and outside relationships, that they have established separate administrative offices responsible for international programs with a director, dean, or even a vice president in charge. Although this kind of administrative control and direction may be highly desirable from a functional point of view, this arrangement does not always prove entirely satisfactory internally, particularly to the regular academic administrative officers and the faculties. The deans of some colleges within a number of universities have claimed that those in charge of international projects have either made contract commitments involving their faculty members without their knowledge or, in some cases, the liaison has been such that internal raiding has been charged. The desirability of such a functional administrative structure in the larger universities cannot be denied, but any agency considering placing a contract would be well advised to ascertain the quality of internal relationships with faculty, heads of departments, and deans as well as with the financial and business segment of the institutions.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The application of this criterion to this category of institutions involves the same considerations as are cited under land-grant universities in the preceding section. Also the comments regarding the trend toward the establishment of special administrative offices for international programs and the internal problems this procedure sometimes presents are as applicable to the public universities and state colleges as to the land-grant institutions.

It should be pointed out that in many states the state universities and the land-grant institutions are probably more autonomous than are the state colleges. The usual structure is for both of the former to have separate boards of trustees or regents, although in some states the land-grant university falls under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Agriculture. However, the state colleges, of which there may be several in any one state, often are under the control of the State Board of Education or some equivalent body. This is an outgrowth of the fact that many of these colleges have sprung from the older state normal schools and teachers' colleges.

Naturally, this criterion must be applied with appropriateness to each separate institution and in the light of the special requirements of each proposed project. It is not uncommon to find that the success or failure of an overseas contract depends upon the kind of administration provided in the institution. This is often related to the smoothness of the internal liaison and relationships between those primarily in charge and those in the pertinent departments who may have other interests and obligations.

Public University Branches

The administrative structure of this type of institution varies widely from institution to institution and, in certain cases, may depart substantially from the structure of the parent university. Usually the pattern is simpler than in the parent and often a specific officer in the branch is subservient to his functional counterpart in the main university; in other cases he is autonomous.

The very history and nature of the branches indicate that they have not developed, to any great extent, special administrative offices responsible for overseas projects.

Although it would not be expected that many cases of overseas developmental programs or projects would be assigned to the typical public university branch, were such a project to be considered, the matter of administrative capability would be one of the criteria that should be carefully applied.

Large Private Universities

The administrative structure of most of the large private universities follows the usual pattern for American academic institutions. Many of these have become sufficiently involved in government grants and contracts, as well as with industrial research projects, to necessitate the establishment of administrative arms of the university responsible for such sponsored programs. In some cases these administrative units are highly autonomous, having the privilege of recruitment and employment of separate research directors and contract managers as well as research personnel without faculty rank or teaching responsibilities. In other cases such contract activities are highly integrated with the normal departments and divisions (both academic and nonacademic) of the university. Both approaches have worked well in different situations and in some instances both procedures are used on the same campus.

Where the interdisciplinary approach to a possible AID project is desirable or necessary, the personality and prestige of the internal coordinator or responsible administrator is critical both in terms of his relationship with the top administrators and with deans, departmental chairmen, and faculty scholars. The predetermination of how well this criterion will be met is one that must be undertaken for each institution and probably for each major contract, although past experience and a look at the general structure already established can serve as indicators of administrative sophistication in an institution.

It should be observed that the private universities have a higher degree of flexibility and freedom than do the public institutions in terms of accounting and control procedures, personnel recruitment, travel arrangements, leaves of absence, and general contractual and administrative procedures. This is not to imply they are better in any way, but they are different in their structure and in their final source of fiduciary responsibility.

Liberal Arts Colleges

One of the critical problems most liberal arts colleges face in undertaking any new and large operational program is their usual lack in depth of administrative personnel. Their established organizational structure is more horizontal than vertical and general rather than specific for specialized functions, with each administrator responsible for several areas. The number of people reporting to one director, dean, or president is apt to be large with a consequent spread of kinds of responsibilities among the few administrators.

Since the liberal arts colleges have had little experience with overseas development programs, as a rule their administrative structures are not particularly well adapted for contract negotiation, fast recruiting of personnel, travel, following complex governmental regulations, or perhaps what to them would be novel accounting methods.

Administrative support as well as faculty and departmental cooperation would usually be present in principle, but it is questionable whether it would be effective in practice.

There is one fairly recent development which tenders some hope for improvement in future expectations when applying this criterion to this category of institutions. This is the increasing trend toward the establishment of foreign study centers at which a portion of their students spend all or a part of one year—usually the junior year. These operations vary considerably from college to college, but, in any case, the experience gained is surely adding to the breadth of administrative know-how and capabilities of those liberal arts colleges which are managing this kind of program. It should be pointed out, however, that most of these centers abroad are in well-developed countries and the kinds of administrative experience gained there might or might not be applicable to international development programs.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Competent and extensive administrative patterns have already been established in many of the institutions within this category. Experience with industrial and government contracts, both for research and operation, often involving fast recruitment of personnel; with substantial foreign student enrollment; with fairly large budgets; and with experience in dealing with foreign visiting scholars has given to many institutions of this kind an opportunity to develop special administrators. These administrators are adept not only in handling special kinds of management problems, but they also have the ability to marshall the support of the top echelon of institutional administration as well as to have good liaison relationships with faculty members and departmental groups.

It would appear that high expectations could be had that this criterion would be adequately fulfilled in this type of institution. It is important enough, however, to warrant careful evaluation when a specific project is being considered for placement at a specific institution.

Junior Colleges

In the case of a vast majority, if not all, of the junior colleges the answer to this general question would be in the negative. A partial exception might be found in a very few institutions of this type, but this criterion can be assumed to be inapplicable.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Although most consortia are cooperative entities with assigned representatives from their member institutions, it cannot be predicted in advance, from the administrative strength of the members, very much about the quality of administrative setup for the consortium. In several cases, none of the members have been able to release a strong administrator from their own staffs, which has made it necessary for the consortium to employ someone from the outside. Although often this has worked out well, it does create the possibility that the consortium administrator, particularly if the consortium is of the single-purpose type, will not be acquainted with the resources available in the member institutions. In such cases it is likely that the administration and operation of the consortium will not be well nourished by the faculties or even by the administrative officers of the component institutions. As a general observation, it can be said that most consortia are more closely related to the top administrators of their members than they are at the faculty or academic administrative levels.

There are cases where a great majority of faculty members, even in pertinent fields, do not know that their institution is a member of a consortium or association designed to carry on a program of great interest to them theoretically. The problem of internal communication within a modern complex university is probably exceeded in magnitude only by that existing between universities even though they may be joined in a consortium.

This criterion is highly cogent with respect to this category of institutions, but must be applied in each specific case with wisdom and a discerning understanding of the potential problem.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 6

"Has the university (or the part of the university most directly involved in the contract) had relevant earlier experience in overseas work? How much experience, and what was the quality of its performance?"

Land-Grant Universities

Most of the land-grant institutions of the nation have had relevant experience in overseas work. As a matter of fact, most of them have been or are currently directly involved in Agency contracts (See Appendix B, page 77). A number have had foundation grants and it would appear that many faculty members (although probably a small percentage of the total) have had overseas assignments, either under their own institution's auspices or under support from other sources.

While no effort has been made in this study to evaluate the quality of performance of any institution relative to their prior or present operation of overseas projects, it is understandable that there would be substantial variation in this regard.

This criterion is still valid, but there is no alternative to applying it on an individual institutional basis when considering a specific university for a contract.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

Many public universities have had Agency contracts and those that have not are likely to have had other types of overseas projects under other auspices. This has been less true with the state college, although many of them have undertaken overseas projects particularly in the field of teacher education and other professional education fields.

It should be pointed out that since the scope of interest of the large public universities is ordinarily broader than that of the land-grant institutions, the kinds of overseas undertakings these institutions engaged in are likely to have been also of a broader type. Their degree of flexibility has provided them with a substantial experience in relevant kinds of development operations and studies.

Since no individual evaluations have been undertaken, it is not possible to comment on the quality of past performance.

Overseas Experience

Public University Branches

Relatively few of the branches of public universities have had direct responsibility for the operation of Agency contracts and it would appear safe to say that few have had any involvement in overseas development work. It is probable, however, that individual faculty and staff members in these branches have had some overseas experience.

The unique position of the faculties and the administrations in their relationships to their parent institutions, together with the usually more limited objectives of the branches, have combined to generate less experience in overseas affairs than might be expected from the size of the branches alone.

Large Private Universities

This category of institutions has had a wealth of past experience in relevant overseas work including Agency contracts for international development. A number of these private universities have been involved in some of the largest undertakings. On the other hand, certain of the better private universities, presumably because of their own policies or because of lack of contacts with the Agency, have never had an AID contract. Some of these, however, have had many programs related to international affairs and have demonstrated undoubted excellence in performance.

Again, in general, because these universities are broad-based in their curricular (except in agriculture) and research activities, their experience in international work has been more interdisciplinary and perhaps less applied than has been true with some of the other categories of institutions.

No effort has been made to appraise or evaluate the quality of performance of any of these individual institutions. This is a criterion which obviously would be applied on an individual basis when a university is being considered for a possible contract.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Very few of the institutions in this category have had any direct experience with the administration of AID contracts for overseas development. On this point, therefore, the criterion is generally inapplicable. However, many of them have had experience with other kinds of overseas or international programs which are relevant and constitute valuable resources as elaborated in other portions of this study. Among the pertinent experiences in which many of these colleges have been involved which may be mentioned are:

- Operation of overseas branches or centers
- Substantial numbers of students from abroad
- Non-Western academic programs
- Language programs (both traditional and unusual)
- Visiting foreign scholars
- Faculty leaves for overseas work
- Memberships in consortia of various kinds

The quality of performance in such work will vary from college to college, but no effort has been made to evaluate the performance of the individual institutions. An evaluation of past performance in a college with respect to its experiences should be made at the time of consideration of placing a contract.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

A substantial amount of prior and relevant experience has been developed in overseas work by many universities and institutes in this category. When an individual institution within this type is considered, the prior experience, however, most likely will be found to have been limited to rather specific and narrow scoped projects. From a management or administrative know-how point of view, such experience would be valuable in further undertakings.

No institutional evaluation of past experience, however, has been made.

Junior Colleges

This question will normally be answered in the negative for this type of institution. For instance, on September 30, 1966, there was only one junior college on AID's list of university contractors.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since consortia have been established both as single-purpose *ad hoc* organizations and as multi-purpose continuing cooperative entities, it should be determined for the purpose of applying this criterion which type of consortium is involved. If it is of the former type, perhaps set up for the sole purpose of administering a proposed specific contract, then obviously it most likely would not have had prior experience and could not have already demonstrated a high quality of performance.

Overseas Experience

On the other hand, the several member institutions and individual representatives possibly might have had experience in overseas work. If, therefore, the right kinds of institutions and people are put together as a consortium for the single purpose of handling an Agency contract, it could, as a matter of fact, marshall the finest experience possible.

In the continuing multi-purpose type of consortia, some have had overseas experience and it should be possible to evaluate their past performances. Since administrative personnel, as well as faculty members assigned to consortia projects from the respective member institutions, are usually subject to rotation back to their home bases, the personnel of the continuing consortia also changes fairly rapidly. For this reason this criterion must be repeatedly and continually applied.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 7

"What is the quality of personnel assigned to this specific project? Has the university (and its departments) made it possible for faculty members to participate without suffering in terms of career advancement?"

Land-Grant Universities

The pertinence of this criterion to the land-grant university could be judged only in relation to the needs of the specific AID project. However, the depth of faculty and administrative staff personnel in this type of institution, as most of them are large, is great enough that it is almost certain that a high quality of personnel would be assigned to a well-conceived project. Some of these institutions, however, are currently growing so fast in enrollment that there could be a tendency to want to keep the best faculty and staff members on campus.

The fact that land-grant institutions are more generally oriented to the service mission (for instance, extension programs and applied research) indicates that the probability of faculty members having their career progress (promotion, tenure, and salary) being prejudiced by overseas assignments is perhaps not as critical as in other types of institutions. These other institutions do not have service mission as a basic object and perhaps put more emphasis on research, teaching, and scholarly publication as a criterion for professional and career promotion.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The public (usually state but occasionally municipally supported) universities are large enough in most cases to make it possible to provide high quality personnel for an overseas project. The question, however, cannot be answered in a satisfactory manner until the proposed assignments to a specific project are suggested. It is also necessary to determine the degree of involvement of those who are proposed on paper for a project. The mere presence on the campus of a well-known expert in a field relevant to the project is not enough, even though he may have said he was greatly interested in the project. He may be so involved with other responsibilities that for all practical purposes he would be of little value to the project being undertaken.

In general, there is a high potential in this category for top quality personnel. The degree to which this criterion is likely to be fulfilled, however, is a matter which must be carefully evaluated in each case.

In the public universities and colleges, the departments are usually large enough to encourage substantial internal competitions for promotion in ranks and salary. When community service is not so institutionally dominant as an objective, it is not certain, without a look at the individual case, whether or not an overseas assignment might not result in the passing-over of an absent faculty member at the time of evaluation for promotion.

Public University Branches

The quality of faculty, both in terms of the usual criteria of quality and in terms of depth of strength in a given field, ordinarily would not be found as high in the branches as in their parent institutions, particularly in the basic academic disciplines and certainly in most of the traditional professional areas. This is demonstrated by an examination of the ratio of doctorates to the total faculty in the branches as compared with the parent institution. There can, however, be a few exceptions to this general observation. There are public universities, for instance, that consider their medical arts and sciences programs (medicine, nursing, dentistry) as being separate branches of the parent campus. This could also be true in certain universities with such areas as adult education and curricula in trade skills and vocational education.

Large Private Universities

As is true with other types of institutions, the application of this criterion necessarily has to be made on an individual project basis, but it is nonetheless important to raise the question in regard to a specific proposed project contract. Generally an adequate quality potential of personnel would be found in this category. As there is a higher degree of stability in size in this category of institutions, the possibility of rotation for overseas assignment may be greater than in other types of institutions which are rapidly growing and which need to utilize all their faculty and staff to meet local teaching demands.

The large private universities are usually old enough to have developed rather sophisticated promotion and tenure policies and, with the absence of political or even civil service type controls applying to them, they can be expected to exhibit somewhat more flexible personnel policies than can the public institutions. This would allow for easier mechanisms for handling overseas assignments without interfering with an individual's career development.

Liberal Arts Colleges

The application of this criterion to this category of institutions is important in view of the fact that, in the majority of cases, the depth of backup strength in most disciplines would be expected to be less than with the large universities. This fact creates more difficulty internally in assigning faculty members to overseas work, particularly for extended periods of time.

Another problem is the usual lack of emphasis on the more applied areas relevant to many international development projects.

With respect to participation of individual faculty members or assignments without their suffering professionally in terms of promotion or tenure, this type of college usually has well-designed personnel policies which are well-known by the faculty and adhered to by the administration. In view of the smaller size of these institutions, with resulting greater personal relationships between faculty and administrative staff (deans and presidents), there is probably a lesser chance of a faculty member on leave being forgotten or passed over at the time of his salary and promotion evaluation. Nevertheless, when one of these institutions is being considered for a contract, this criterion should be applied because of the nature of this type of college. The assumptions of personnel policies and strengths that might be made in the case of larger universities might not be valid with the typical liberal arts college.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

This type of institution as a rule has had a great amount of experience working in close relationships with government agencies, business, and industry. For many years, faculty members have served as consultants either on leave for a year or two or on a continuing part-time basis. Because of this tradition of service, most of these scientific and engineering universities and institutes have well-developed policies which cover the problem described in this criterion. As a matter of fact, the professional and career advancement credit extended to a faculty member for overseas development work well might be enhanced in many cases rather than placed in an unfavorable light by evaluators.

In view of the degree of specialization often found in these institutions, the matter of quality of faculty assigned to a specific project might be found to be more crucial and questionable in fields outside the central theme of the project. Naturally, this problem would arise to a greater degree in those projects which are broadly interdisciplinary in scope.

Here again, although this criterion is important in the consideration of this as well as all other types of institutions, it would have to be applied in specific ways to the individual project after the requirements of the project are well defined.

Junior Colleges

The pertinence of this question to the junior college only could be judged in relation to the needs of the specific AID project. However, were a junior college being considered for a contract, the importance of this criterion very well might be of controlling significance. This would be largely because the usual expectations of the typical junior college would lead to the conclusion that this criterion probablv, or even usually, would not be met adequately. Because of the predominance of the teaching mission of the junior or community college, the flexibility of the total faculty in terms of mobility is perhaps less apparent than in other types of institutions.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

The comments under criterion eight (see page 47) as applied to consortia are pertinent to this criterion. It should be emphasized, however, that the personnel assigned to a specific project contracted by the Agency to a consortium should be in theory of the highest quality since, in a way, they would be handpicked for the specific undertaking from the faculties and administrative staffs of all the member institutions.

It can be assumed, however, that this happy situation might not be assured in every case. There is a feeling that sometimes institutions would like to farm out a few of their less-effective people to a consortium for the purpose of getting rid of them—at least temporarily. Such a motive might, if carried far, result in a personnel cadre in a specific consortium project of far lower quality than would be expected from the average quality of the member institutions.

This criterion would therefore appear to be of very high importance in this category of institutions, but it is one that must be applied in a given case with great care and with a high degree of evaluative judgment.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 8

"What is the degree of the university's commitment to the projects? This is not merely a matter of the university's saying, 'We're terribly interested.' Its commitment can be partly measured by judging the extent to which it has already developed its resources in the international field generally and in the fields relevant to the specific contract. Its future intentions should be explored in some detail. What will it do to strengthen its resources further as the contract proceeds? How does it plan to integrate the overseas project with its home-base operations? What arrangements will it make to insure feedback from the field experience into curriculum and research on the campus?"

Land-Grant Universities

When the history, original purpose, and sources of control and support of this category of institutions are examined, a commitment to overseas development projects, with all these projects imply, would not be expected to exist in the land-grant university. But if the actual involvement (commitment may be another matter), the total number, or the dollar value of Agency development contracts being managed by the land-grant institutions are used as yardstick, it must be concluded that they are committed in a major way. To be sure, a substantial part of their overseas development work has been because of their strength in agricultural research, teaching, and service.

The commitment, as measured by affirmative and positive answers to questions bearing on this criterion as suggested by Mr. Gardner, would indicate that this rather extensive involvement has had a very significant impact on the institutions themselves. However, this observation will be found valid to varying degrees within the category of institutions and with a wide range of sometimes unexpected results.

In the literature published by these institutions, such as catalogs, sometimes there is a complete absence of any mention of commitment or even involvement in overseas contracts. There is in some cases almost an apologetic attitude for their involvement:

"We have been requested by the Federal government to contract for the operation of a program in . . ."

It is difficult to evaluate or measure the magnitude of the potential feedback into the curriculum and research programs of this category of institutions. As a matter of fact, when an intensive look is taken at the effect of overseas projects on a single institution, it may be difficult to isolate and describe any discreet effect on the specific or general mode of operation of that institution. Perhaps it is too early to observe the long-term internal effects. Some impact on research programs of local institutions is observable, although few curriculum changes have resulted from overseas projects. The land-grant institutions have undoubtedly strengthened the public interest in world affairs through their efforts.

In summary, after a number of years of involvement in international development projects, many of the institutions in this category are committed to this type of activity and they can be expected to broaden their horizons of interest to include more specific areas of interest, both relevant to their internal affairs as well as to the needs of the Agency.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The public universities and state colleges which make up this category cover a wide variety of institutions. Therefore, there is a great variation in their degree of commitment to overseas development work. In general, the state colleges, for reasons cited in other parts of this study, are not largely involved nor committed to this kind of assignment. The public universities, however, are thoroughly involved and may be assumed to be officially committed, although at the faculty level the interest is spotty and sometimes it may even be antagonistic. In a number of state universities having overseas programs, a definite trend can be observed toward curriculum changes (for instance, development of expanded foreign language programs), broadly-based area studies and research interests, and even an increased emphasis on international affairs (including foreign trade, foreign policy, and international education).

From the evidence and in view of the widening spectrum of the objectives of the large public universities, there should be an increasing commitment of these institutions to international development projects. They are, in most cases, improving their resources, and are already strong in many areas relevant to the total requirements of the Agency.

It should be pointed out, however, that while most of these universities are committed to the concept of world-wide interests —and this is manifest in their expansion of curricula and research programs to include problems of national and international scope rather than just of local or state concern—it is true that some have little interest in becoming involved in government agency contract work of the development type. It is one thing to discover a thorough interest in international affairs on a given campus. It is quite another (and this requires careful investigation and judgment) to determine a solid and bona fide commitment to the management of development contracts.

It would be an interesting exercise to examine the requests for appropriations going from institutions to their legislative bodies as indicators of institutional commitment to overseas development work. This was not done with the Academy's sample institutions since such information would not have been available on anything like a complete or comparable basis.

Public University Branches

The history of the branch operation of the large public universities, including the reasons for their establishment, their current objectives, their curricula, and the relationships with their parent universities, indicates that there is no substantial commitment to the idea of direct involvement in the management of overseas development projects. Where there is action at all in this regard, it occurs in the few cases where the chief administrative officer of the branch has a personal capability and interest in a particular project of interest to the Agency.

It would appear that when the more specific questions raised by Mr. Gardner under this criterion are applied to the typical branch university, the answers would add up to something less than a real and present commitment to overseas development projects.

This conclusion is more fully supported when an attempt is made, as has been done, to apply other criteria to this type of institution.

Large Private Universities

What has been observed in regard to the application of this criterion to the large public university is generally applicable also to the large private university. One difference is that the latter type in most cases does not find itself in the position of justifying its interest in international affairs to a local controlling and supporting body such as a state legislature or a state board of regents. But for the same reason, some of the private universities have not developed their interest in or commitment to the service function to a higher degree. Hence, some are taking the position that they do not see, as a part of their total obligation or commitment, any place for their involvement in overseas contracts. This does not mean that they are not making contributions to the whole area of international development, but it may be in less formal ways that do not require AID contracts.

It appears that project research or project operation is a technique that many faculty members of private universities do not relish. To them, the strictures required are not acceptable.

Because of the wide variety of attitudes, policies, and modes of operation found in the large private universities, the assumption that all of them are committed to an involvement in overseas development projects would not be a valid one. Therefore, it is altogether necessary that this criterion be applied individually to each institution and with a specific project in mind.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Although there is great interest on the campuses of liberal arts colleges in the general area of international affairs, there is little real commitment to an active involvement in overseas development programs. This is not surprising in view of the predominant commitment to undergraduate education in this type of institution. Action programs, operational involvement, research, and service activities generally are not a significant part of the basic objectives of the liberal arts colleges.

With possibly an exception or two, the conclusion must be reached that, for contract purposes, this category of institutions does not represent a significantly important source of potential interest or of resources. This does not preclude the possibility that there are on many of their faculties a few individuals who are interested, capable, and who might be available through assignment to consortia-managed contracts or attached to the overseas staff of another contractor. There probably would be a direct feedback from such field experience to their own campus, but this could be expected to be rather sparse and sporadic in terms of a major effect on the total campus attitude as reflected in curriculum or research.

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Because this category of institutions has had wide experience with government and industry sponsored research and consulting contracts, it is expected that they should have developed substantial commitments to international development projects.

These commitments are reflected both in terms of what they feel will be the impact on their own programs (educational and research) and in terms of their motivation to serve the economic and social enrichment of all nations.

It is not difficult to see how such institutions have found that many international development projects fit directly into their own programs of industrial and technological development.

Many of these institutions have found that there has been a substantial feedback from their involvement in overseas operations. The manifestation of this effect, however, has been confined to perhaps narrower fields than would be the case with the broader purpose universities.

Junior Colleges

The commitment of the junior and community colleges to overseas development appears to be more of a stated principle rather than an actual practice, judging from a general view of the very limited extent to which they have already established and developed resources and experience in the international field. Although individuals within these colleges have in some cases participated in international projects, particularly in the summer, this type of institution has not ordinarily seen participation in overseas projects as an institutional objective.

With the possible exception of the organization and operation of an overseas adult education, trade skill teaching, or subprofessional technical program, a typical AID project would most likely not have much feedback to the junior college, certainly not in the substantive disciplines or for the purpose of research studies.

A typical comment from junior college administrations is: "Yes, we are interested and there are many things we surely would be able to do, but frankly we are so new, are growing so fast, and we have so many things to do here that we just have not had time to develop overseas work." Such expressions are not at all exceptional and are without doubt logical and legitimate.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Although this criterion is not applicable to consortia in the same way it is applicable to individual educational institutions, it is definitely not without importance or validity. In the case of the single-purpose type of consortium, established for the sole purpose of administering an overseas development contract, a commitment to this objective should be assumed. However, even here there should be an assurance that the commitment runs deeper than just the feeling on the part of the presidents of a group of similar institutions that they should be involved in an overseas contract or project—perhaps just because they are available or because it would "look good."

The problem of feedback in terms of effect or impact on curricula or on research in the consortium's member institutions is even greater than it is when the individual institution has total and direct responsibility. There are cases where a member's real commitment to its consortium, let alone its commitment to the project of the consortium, can be questioned. This is particularly true of the multipurpose, any purpose, associations or consortia which have been established to "do all those things which the members cannot do alone."

The difficulties which consortia have encountered in the administration of joint undertakings notwithstanding, those organizations with growing experience are proving to be a valuable resource in overseas development work. Some of them are showing a real commitment to getting the job done with skill and efficiency. Time will still have to prove how often they produce a real impact on their member institutions. They should, both from the view of the government and from the view of the institutions, do more than provide their members with an opportunity to be involved. Is the involvement likely to be of benefit to (a) the institution, (b) the government, and (c) the host country?

PART II—MAJOR TYPES OF CONSORTIA, AND OTHER COOPERATIVE INSTRUMENTALITIES

Introduction

One of the three specific assignments given to the Academy for Educational Development was stated in the contract as follows:

> "Starting from the section of the Gardner Report entitled "Nongovernmental Arrangements," the Contractor will describe in detail and recommend, with criteria for choice, what kinds of instrumentalities are needed, are practicable, and will most effectively serve to promote multiple-university efforts in A.I.D. programs."

Mr. Gardner did not go far in his report in describing the various kinds of instrumentalities or structures now in existence for the purpose of securing a wide variety of kinds of inter-institutional cooperation. One paragraph of his, however, serves as an introduction to the problem: *

> "We have listened carefully to both the enthusiasts and the skeptics on the university *consortium*. Both are convincing, and the evidence is not yet available that would prove one right and the other wrong. Clearly, the consortium can be made to work and work well. Whether it is a widely useful device remains to be seen. For the present, we would be wise not to confine ourselves to that fashionable idea but to reflect on the whole range of instrumentalities that universities have used or could use to accomplish their purposes—from Brookhaven to the American Council on Education."

Although the American higher educational establishment is made up of a wide variety of kinds of components and although, in a sense, it is highly organized in terms of membership in many kinds of organizations, * * it is true that the members of the establishment have not worked very hard at the matter of inter-institutional cooperation at the substantive or functional level. It is interesting to note that one of the oldest and most effective examples is the intercollegiate athletic conference. But here the prime purpose is the control of a competitive institutional enterprise rather than the strengthening of individual institutions in a cooperative problem-solving venture.

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities*, page 41.

** See *Education Directory*, Part 4, Education Associations, 1965-1966, United States Office of Education.

Today there are probably hundreds of examples of cooperative efforts. They go by many different names—consortia, associations, institutes, councils, commissions, committees, boards, conferences, for instance. But we agree with Mr. Gardner that it still is unclear what are the best kinds of instrumentalities to serve specific functions such as overseas development work.

On the following pages, ten different kinds of instrumentalities or consortia are described, a few examples are noted, their strong and weak points are analyzed, and an indication is given of their likelihood of serving effectively in the promotion of multiple-university efforts in the AID program. Fourteen specific criteria or questions are also listed that can be applied to each type of instrumentality or consortium in an effort to be helpful to the Agency as it considers its relationships with a broader base of university and college resources.

Major Types of Consortia, Associations, and Other Instrumentalities for Cooperative Undertakings

1. Large associations with generally inclusive membership
   Examples: American Council on Education
   Association of American Colleges

2. Associations of like-minded institutions
   Examples: Jesuit Educational Association
   National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

3. Government-related organizations
   Examples: Southern Regional Education Board
   Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

4. Single-purpose consortia
   Examples: Associated Universities, Inc.
   Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities

5. Multipurpose consortia
   Examples: Associated Colleges of the Midwest
   Associated Rocky Mountain Universities

6. Profit corporations
   Examples: Arthur D. Little, Inc.
   Westinghouse Learning Corporation

7. Nonprofit corporations, institutes, or associations
   Examples: Academy for Educational Development
   Educational Services Incorporated
   Institute of International Education
   Overseas Educational Service
   The Rand Corporation
   System Development Corporation

8. Central university associated with group of satellite colleges
   Examples: University of Denver with Colorado College, Loretta Heights College, Colorado Woman's College, and Regis College
   Western Massachusetts Group
9. Professional associations
   Examples: American Bar Association
   American Medical Association
10. Scientific and cultural associations and societies
   Examples: American Chemical Society
   American Physical Society

Special Criteria Applicable to Consortia and Other Cooperative Instrumentalities

1. What was the rationale or purpose for the original establishment of the consortium or association?
2. What is the nature of its component membership?
3. Does the instrumentality, as a body, have the support and interest of both the faculties and administration of its member institutions?
4. Is it an *ad hoc* single-purpose organization or has it been established to do anything or everything that no single member could do alone?
5. When was it organized?
6. Has the organization had any experience with operational or service contracts with any other agency?
7. What are the indications that it can assemble, from its member institutions or from other sources, an adequately expert and qualified technical staff for the purpose of the specific project?
8. Does the organization have capacities that a single member component does not have? If so, what capacities?
9. Is the organization properly incorporated as a legal body so that it may have contracting authority?
10. Does it have an administrative staff with managerial and accounting ability and authority?
11. Who has the decision-making authority, the organization or its members?
12. What is the extent and source of the organization's working capital?
13. Does it have a headquarters office?
14. What is the likelihood of feedback of values gained by the experience to individaul member institutions?

Large Associations With Generally Inclusive Membership

This category of instrumentality available to the Agency for overseas development work and related activities is of the type represented by such organizations as the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges. These organizations, and there are few others of this type representing the colleges and universities of the United States, are large in terms of number of member institutions (there are over one thousand) and include most of the accredited institutions of the nation. They are in a strategic and accepted position of being able to "speak" for the American higher educational establishment—that is, if any organization can. Their purposes are broad, and they are properly chartered and have contracting authority. One of these two specific organizations has a substantial and highly competent staff and both operate through commissions designed to give special attention to the various areas of interest to higher education.

When the various suggested criteria are applied to this kind of organization it becomes apparent that, although they are great sources of advice and intelligence of value to the Agency and have been used to a substantial degree, they ordinarily are not available for direct or primary operation of specific overseas development contracts. For special studies, evaluations, consultations, and planning purposes such associations can be and have already proven to be of assistance to the Agency.

One particular area in which these general purpose associations can be of great value to the Agency, as well as to all colleges and universities, is in serving as a medium of communication. Through their annual meetings (very fully attended by university presidents), their commissions, and more importantly, through their reports, newsletters, bulletins, and special documents which are widely read by university administrators, the work and needs of the Agency can be brought to the attention of the college and university community.

Associations of Like-Minded Institutions

Into this category of cooperative instrumentalities, a knowledge of which is useful to the Agency, is placed the non-all-inclusive but more specialized associations of colleges and universities so organized because of the special interests of their members. Such organizations may be national, regional, or state in geographic scope or they may be made up of departments, schools, or colleges having common professional interests. Similar types of institutions based on their sources of control or support have their own organizations.

The following are cited as examples of what is referred to as associations of like-minded institutions. There are many others. (See *Education Directory*, Part 4, Education Associations, annual publication of the United States Office of Education.)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business
Association of American Law Schools
Association of American Medical Colleges
Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of Urban Universities

This category of associations includes only those in which the membership is institutional rather than individual. An example of two different types of associations would be the Association of American Veterinary Colleges on the one hand and the American Veterinary Medical Association on the other. Both of these types of organizations might well serve the needs of the Agency.

Most of the associations within this category have relatively small professional staffs, if any at all. Generally, but not always, these organizations of like-minded institutions are involved with standards and accreditation. Some make studies of concern to their own members and the majority publish newsletters if not more formal bulletins. The conducting of active programs or contract services is unusual in this group of associations. The problem of immediate decision-making can be a matter of importance and very difficult with this type of organization because of the geographic separation of the members and even of the members of the executive board. Concurrence rather than decision is the usual mode of operation.

It could be expected that little interest or strength would be found on the part of this type of instrumentality for the purpose of operating Agency contracts for overseas development. For advisory purposes, and also for the strengthening of communication between the Agency and the colleges and universities which are members of such associations, this category is a resource that could be of substantial potential value to the Agency. Many of these associations are concerned with precisely the areas and disciplines of greatest interest to the Agency in the over-all problem of international development.

Government-Related Organizations

A relatively new type of entity of increasing interest to the whole field of higher education is what is referred to as the "government-related" organization. Examples of this type are the "super boards," "coordinating councils," or "state commissions" (several other names are used) established by state legislatures to supervise, control, coordinate, or operate the total or at least a part of the public higher education in the state. This category should also include state systems such as the California State Colleges or the Board of Regents of the University of California, where there are in each case, in fact, several colleges or universities with separate campuses, faculties, and administration, under the jurisdiction of a single board.

Another type of government-related organization is the consortium or compact of states joined for the purpose of conducting or contracting for certain types of educational programs that some of its member states cannot adequately provide. In addition, such compact organizations are engaged in studies in the field of education which are of concern to the states. Examples of this type of interstate organization established by the governments of the states rather than by the educational institutions themselves are the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board.

A third example of cooperative organizations related to government is the Interstate Compact for Education, founded in 1966, which joins a large number of states in a nationwide effort to confront state educational problems on the national level. This organization is still in its formative stages.

It can be concluded from the rationale for the formation of such organizations that they would have no great interest in overseas development work in particular or international matters in general. However, and particularly in the case of the state systems, this may not always be true. An opposite example is the recent case of a state system of colleges contracting with the Agency for the education of a substantial number of college-age students from a Southeast Asian country. Here the system manages the contract, coordinates the program, and distributes the students for their education among the member colleges of the system. At least for the foreseeable future, the interstate compact groups cannot be expected to be significant resources for most kinds of overseas development projects. In special cases, however, they may prove to be an instrumentality useful to the Agency.

Single-Purpose Consortia

There have been a number of cases where it has been found advantageous to a government agency or to a group of colleges or universities to establish a single-purpose (or sometimes for related purposes) association or consortium with the objective of jointly conducting a specific undertaking which none of the members could do alone adequately.

V

Perhaps the first of such organizations on the educational scene were the state associations of private colleges established to provide for cooperative undertakings such as purchasing, library acquisitions, recruiting, joint faculty appointments, and lecture and concert tours. Through the discovery and development of such successful joint operations for special purposes, several government agencies have participated in the establishment of consortia for the purpose of operating research centers, overseas development and training projects, and other endeavors.

The University Corporation for Atmospheric Research was established by a group of about 20 universities for the sole purpose of operating the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado. Brookhaven National Laboratory is managed by an association of eastern universities. The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., was established primarily for the single purpose to operate overseas development contracts or grants. There are other examples of this type of consortia.

When the special criteria suggested on page 51 are applied to this type of organization, the conclusion would be that it is a feasible and fruitful kind of approach which the Agency should find useful. Most of the technical requirements for a successful contract operation should be fulfilled. However, if one of the over-all purposes of AID's utilization of university and college resources is to develop the broad capabilities of these institutions, then a question might be raised as to what extent there would be a real impact on the individual member campus from such an arrangement. By the same token it would appear that, in the other direction, in some cases the only real involvement of the individual institutions in the consortium is administrative. Mr. Gardner observed that "If the multiuniversity sponsorship of Brookhaven were abolished tomorrow, it is doubtful that the operation would change significantly." * If this is likely to be the case for any proposed single-purpose consortium, about the only advantage of this approach is either to gain a kind of university prestige for the project or perhaps, in some cases, to gain the freedom from certain Federal government restrictions. Neither of these reasons are likely to generate any large amount of enthusiasm on the part of faculties in general.

Multipurpose Consortia

There has been a recent trend toward the formation of consortia of institutions, usually regionally based, with the primary but ill-defined purpose of "doing those things that none of us can do alone." Some of these organizations have been organized

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities,* page 42.

as a result of local or regional pride with the hope the organization might be able to win for its region a large Federal installation which could add to the technical resources of the community. Others have grown as multi-purpose consortia, in theory available to take on almost any kind of assignment, as a result of some particular or specific opportunity to engage in a cooperative undertaking.

It would appear as a result of testing the criteria on this type of consortia that they have several inherent weaknesses. In general they do not have wide support from their member institutions either administratively or from the faculty point of view. Sometimes they are felt to be competitive with some of their own members. Usually they are not well staffed and have little working capital which can be used for planning and for effective operation prior to receiving a contract. The typical pattern is to operate through committees made up of busy faculty members and administrative officers. These are drawn from the member institutions on a part-time basis, and most of them are more interested in promoting the interests of their own institutions or their personal research programs than they are in giving real time and attention to the cooperative effort, particularly if the consortium is in the stage of "looking for something good to do."

The problem of proper and equitable assignment of overhead costs between different projects and activities being pursued at a given time seems to have given rise to conflicts with some sponsors. Division of overhead income between member institutions in consortia of this type has produced some internal differences of opinion.

In theory, this type of consortium has much to offer, and we may well see further developments of this kind, although it should be pointed out that, with perhaps a few exceptions, the single-purpose type of consortium offers AID considerable advantages over the multipurpose consortium for the successful operation of a contract for a specific overseas development project.

Profit Corporations

Although this type of organization does not directly involve colleges and universities as members, some of the profit research and development companies often do consider themselves closely related to specific educational institutions. Several companies, having been spin-offs from universities, are located nearby and commonly use faculty and graduate students as consultants and part-time employees. For these reasons this category of instrumentalities might be considered as a contracting entity for potential overseas development projects, as it has the ability to capture the resources of both large and small educational institutions for special kinds of overseas operations. It should be pointed out that this type of organization is not limited to the more usual scientific and engineering research fields. There are profit firms which are engaged solely in training programs, and undoubtedly some of these are quite expert in and have had much experience in programs such as trade skills and vocational training.

The following are examples of this broad type of profit organizations:

Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Falcon Research and Development Company
General Learning Corporation
J. G. White Engineering Corporation
Raytheon Corporation
Tipton and Kalmback, Inc.
Westinghouse Learning Corporation

Nonprofit Corporations, Institutes, or Associations

Although this type of organization does not directly involve colleges and universities in terms of contract responsibilities, they do relate to the educational establishment in several important ways. Such corporations often draw a substantial proportion of their trustees or directors from both administrators and faculty of universities, and their administrative staffs are commonly recruited from the university community. The nonprofit firms are knowledgeable about where the experts in various fields are located and have had great success in recruiting personnel from educational institutions both for short-term and long-term assignments.

Many of these organizations have developed an image of great prestige, a factor which has enhanced their ability to recruit. Their use of consultants from the academic world has been quite substantial and has provided them with great strength. Although this technique does produce some problems on the campus occasionally, most educators would agree that the involvement of faculty members in activities sponsored by this kind of outside organization has had a beneficial result.

The nonprofit corporations vary widely in their fields of operation, purposes, and mode of operation. From the standpoint of corporate organization, decision-making power, staff, financial strength, recruiting ability, and in terms of most of our criteria, this type of organization presents a favorable potential picture as a resource for AID's use.

The question might be raised of whether the increasing use of this kind of organization by many government agencies is likely to have adverse effects on the higher educational system of our nation. The problems faced in the area of international development, however, are so diverse in scope that it would appear that many of these problems will fall outside the framework of the long-term goals of the university. The utilization of the third-party nonprofit type of organization as a mechanism for meeting the needs of AID may prove to be not only a satisfactory solution to the Agency's problems, but in many cases also may serve as an indirect method of developing university resources in international affairs without compromising some of their own institutional values.

As examples of nonprofit corporations, associations, and institutes, the following are from a long list, many of which have already had experience in cooperating in many ways with AID and its predecessor agencies:

Academy for Educational Development
Battelle Memorial Institute
Education and World Affairs
Educational Services Incorporated
Institute of International Education
Overseas Educational Service
The Rand Corporation
System Development Corporation

Central University Associated with Group of Satellite Colleges

A natural outgrowth of the growing complexity of higher education, including the proliferation of curricula, the desire for greater research opportunities, and the pressure on educational institutions to provide a wide variety of services to the local, national, or world community, has been the developing experiment of cooperative programs involving a central complex university together with a group of neighboring liberal arts colleges. Although this type of consortium is still a fairly rare structure within the total higher education scene, there may be so many advantages to this kind of format that it may well be utilized to a far greater extent in the not too distant future. This kind of experiment is not unrelated, although different in form, to outright mergers of institutions (such as the recent Western Reserve University-Case Institute of Technology merger) and to the formation of cluster colleges as at Claremont, California.

Two examples are cited of the central university-satellite college type of consortium, both being in existence at the present time, which are counterparts of others being discussed:

- The Western Massachusetts college-university group which includes the University of Massachusetts affiliated with Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges.
- The Colorado Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which includes the University of Denver with Loretto Heights, Regis, and Colorado Woman's Colleges, all in Denver; and Colorado College in Colorado Springs.

This type of consortium would appear to provide resources available to AID which could meet most of the established criteria for potentially successful international development contracts. However, it should not be taken for granted that they automatically would be interested in taking on such an activity.

Professional Associations

Although the professional associations such as the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association are not educational institutions, they are included in this study because (a) they are vitally involved in many ways with the professional schools and colleges, and (b) their membership (usually individuals) is to a varying but often large degree made up of faculty members of colleges and universities.

Through committees and staff these associations typically are knowledgeable about and are in contact with the people and programs available in the universities. Although these professional associations could not be expected to be interested in managing an overseas development contract, they can be useful for advice, evaluation, and for recruiting purposes. This kind of association, through their publications and personal contacts, can often provide both prestige and effective channels of communication between a government agency and personnel in colleges and universities.

Scientific and Cultural Associations and Societies

The comments made in the preceding section, "Professional Associations," are applicable to the case of the scientific and cultural associations and societies such as the American Chemical Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, or the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In view of the fact that such societies ordinarily are not likely to be interested in developing contractual relations with AID for the operation of overseas development projects, no attempt has been made to apply the usual criteria to them.

PART III—IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT ON THE UNIVERSITY

There is a general agreement that if universities are to be properly involved in the nation's international development undertaking, there should be a resulting improvement of the university's strength in terms of resources and capabilities pertinent to its own objectives As Mr. Gardner pointed out: ". . . in its overseas activities as well as at home, the university will function as a university and not merely as a pool of technical talent or an employment broker. It will remember that its unique role is not to apply present knowledge but to *advance the state of knowledge,* not only to supply experts today but to *train the next generation of experts.*" * But experts are now, and will continue to be, people—individuals with knowledge, know-how, and motivation. Therefore, the question can well be asked: "Is the involvement of a university in overseas development work having an impact on its people, including students, faculty, and other constituents?"

Perhaps after years of involvement of American universities in international work including the operation of overseas development contracts, it is time for an assessment of the results. Much has been written and substantial statistical evidence has been gathered pointing to positive results of such involvement of these institutions in many aspects of international activity. It is difficult to relate these results in any quantitative way to the specific matter of the impact of AID overseas contracts on universities.

If people are the important ingredient, and universities, in cooperation with government agencies, are the means, the premise that overseas contracts are strengthening the over-all capabilities of universities in international affairs can be tested, albeit inadequately.

In the course of this study, the following facts have been examined as related to each of the institutions constituting the sample:

---

* *A.I.D. and the Universities,* page 11.

- Number of foreign students on campus
- Percentage of foreign students to total enrollment
- Number of faculty members spending all or part of current year abroad.
- Percentage of faculty members abroad to total faculty
- Number of foreign scholars visiting the university
- Percentage of visiting foreign scholars to total faculty
- Actual numerical change and percentage change in each of the above items between 1960-1961 and 1965-1966 at each of the 108 sample institutions.

Great care should be taken in drawing any general conclusions from this type of data, and comparisons between contract and noncontract institutions within the sample of institutions included in this study could lead to false specific judgments. However, this kind of factual information about a specific institution, as generally related to a group of similar ones, can be useful in applying the criteria for the selection of potential institutions for contracts. Certainly this kind of information does answer the question of whether an institution is "committed" to international work and whether or not, as measured by these kinds of involvement, there is a chance for a major impact on the total work of the university.

For the purpose of illustration, let us consider two universities which might be considered similar in most ways. They are about the same size in terms of faculty and total enrollment, are both public in control and support, and are located in the same general geographic region. Many educators would place them, to the extent such comparisons can be properly made, at about the same level of quality. Institution "A" has held contracts with AID; institution "B" has not.

Table 1 on page 62 shows the data regarding foreign student enrollment (both absolute and relative to total enrollment), foreign scholars on campus (both absolute and relative to total faculty), and university faculty members abroad (both absolute and relative to total faculty), in these two otherwise comparable universities, for both academic years 1960-1961 and 1965-1966.

TABLE 1. Comparison of Foreign Students and Scholars and Faculty Members Abroad at Two Similar Universities*

	University A	University B
1960-1961 Total enrollment	10,036	11,113
1965-1966 Total enrollment	13,565	16,335
Percentage increase in total enrollment	35.1%	47.0%
1960-1961 Foreign students on campus	247	187
1965-1966 Foreign students on campus	526	285
Percentage increase in foreign students	113.0%	52.4%
Percentage of foreign students to total student body, 1960-1961	2.5%	1.7%
Percentage of foreign students to total student body, 1965-1966	3.9%	1.7%
1960-1961 Total faculty	623	710
1965-1966 Total faculty	860	901
Percentage increase in size of faculty	38.0%	26.9%
1960-1961 Foreign scholars on campus	6	14
1965-1966 Foreign scholars on campus	77	21
Percentage increase in foreign scholars	1,183.3%	50.0%
Percentage of foreign scholars to total faculty, 1960-1961	1.0%	2.0%
Percentage of foreign scholars to total faculty, 1965-1966	9.0%	2.3%
1960-1961 Faculty abroad	11	7
1965-1966 Faculty abroad	31	15
Percentage increase in faculty abroad	181.8%	114.3%
Percentage of total faculty abroad, 1960-1961	1.8%	1.0%
Percentage of total faculty abroad, 1965-1966	3.6%	1.7%

* University A has held AID contracts; university B has not.

This kind of comparison has been applied to a number of pairs of like institutions in the sample. This is dangerous, and one should not be quick to draw conclusions from the results. There are just too many variables in terms of traditions, objectives, stated or unstated purposes, structure, and the uncertainty of the reported data to warrant assumed validity of the picture. Also, causes and effects sometimes get mixed up.

Nevertheless, the comparison of the two institutions, "A" and "B" in Table 1 indicates a pattern that was not at all unusual in the tests that were run. It does appear that those institutions having AID contracts are receiving a higher percentage of foreign students than are the otherwise similar noncontract universities. Likewise, this observation would seem to hold with visiting foreign scholars on the campus and with the number and proportion of faculty members visiting overseas. It cannot be proved that this is directly the effect of contract involvement. It may be, however, a partially valid measure of what is too often vaguely referred to as "commitment." It is of interest to point out that this apparent relationship may result indirectly in a general stimulation of international interest on the campus. For instance, as a rule, there are far more United States faculty members traveling abroad from fields and disciplines of little or no formal interest to AID (for example, the humanities) than there are from fields thought to be of more direct interest to the Agency (such as engineering or agriculture).

PART IV—COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

In this section is presented a compendium of comments and observations gathered from a wide variety of sources during the conduct of this study. Although some are worded in the form of recommendations, they are submitted merely for review and consideration by AID rather than as recommendations by the Academy for Educational Development. Some are undoubtedly valid, some are feasible and even desirable, and some may be the result of out-of-date information and therefore are no longer pertinent.

With respect to the information available

1. The volume of information available at universities and colleges that could be useful to AID is overwhelming. It rolls off printing presses, spins out of computers, accumulates in file cabinets and libraries, and is assembled and duplicated for government reports and newspaper stories. It piles up in countless offices, frequently in multiple copies. The information, however, is largely in the form of raw data or is incorporated in special-purpose reports, and has to be processed to be useful.

2. The practical problem is how to dig through this goldmine of material, analyze, refine, and process it, and then extract that critical fraction of information essential to both the universities and AID. This procedure is a real task for every institution, time-consuming, frequently onerous, and accomplishment is usually possible only by assigning to it the most knowledgeable (and usually the busiest) men on campus.

3. No one has really solved the information problem. Educational administrators readily say they haven't time enough or energy enough to read all the reports or study all the data available to them. They acknowledge the fact that they have to make some policy decisions without all the critical background data. On the other hand, they do not like to see or to recommend that a government agency such as AID follow this practice. Many agree that AID should have a file of relevant and critical information that provides a comprehensive background for *all* members of the group of universities or colleges from which the selection of a contract or grant recipient must be made. The file would have to be organized, written, collated, and culled, and should cover a broad range of matters, but it also has to contain pinpointed material as needed. It is essential as the basis for prudent decisions by government personnel.

With respect to an inventory of information like that assembled by the Academy for AID

1. Well-trained and capable people are required to maintain up-to-date records as extensive as those in the proposed file, to analyze the data, to put key information into a computer or other data-processing system, and to summarize the pertinent information for contracting officers. The cost of such a staff may run to as much as $100,000 a year. A government agency can surely afford to spend this fraction out of $150 to $200 million in outstanding contracts in order to have ready access to a wide variety of essential background information.

2. Much of the information assembled and submitted with this report was available at the universities and colleges visited. It just had not been brought together previously.

3. Some university and college administrators found useful management data for their own institutions in the Academy's checklist of information requested for the reports, and they used the Academy's request (and AID's need) as an opportunity to compile the information for their own purposes.

4. Officials of other institutions, while recognizing the value of the requested data to themselves and to the government, were distressed by the cost of these and other constant demands for descriptive and statistical information and the burden they put on top officials. They felt that the magnitude of the information-assembly job was such that they could not afford the requisite allocation of time and staff.

5. A small group of institutions said they could not interfere with their own activities in order to meet the government's need for information. They took the position that if the government needed the information and its assembly was costly, the government should pay the cost.

6. After the information was assembled, many administrators found the data extremely revealing. They just had not known what resources for overseas development activities were available at their institution, how vast these resources actually were, or the extent of their institution's recent accomplishments.

7. Despite the clerical work involved, it is practical for institutions of higher education to assemble a file of detailed information on their resources and capabilities for overseas development activities for AID's Washington office. The process is probably not nearly as costly as some administrators claim. Moreover, once the file had been assembled, it could be kept up-to-date rather easily with the key materials placed in a computer or other data-processing system for quick retrieval and study by AID.

8. The year-to-year changes in personnel, programs, and emphasis in many institutions are so great that last year's information on resources for overseas development activities may be obsolete. This means new information is required every year or even more often.

With respect to the resources available for overseas development activities

1. The resources of American universities and colleges for overseas development activities are impressive in amount, quality, range, and diversity. It is probable that at least 450 to 500 institutions have resources for overseas development that could be useful to AID in a wide variety of fields—from economics to public health, from agriculture to engineering, from geography to education. They draw on faculty and administrators with a broad array of skills, training, background, and experience.

2. The extensiveness of these rich resources does not imply that they are now or will be easily available to AID or any outside agency. In most colleges and universities, the best resources are already committed (in many cases overcommitted) to the development of their own educational programs, the needs of increasing enrollment, and the planning for new construction of facilities and reoriented academic objectives.

3. All types of colleges and universities, both large and small, have resources that might be useful to AID. The institutions are located in every part of the country, and there are no geographic limitations or advantages that stand out. However, institutions with 150 or fewer faculty members and key administrators are usually too small to mount off-campus programs effectively. The predominantly Negro colleges, women's colleges, and most of the smaller liberal-arts colleges visited for the study were all in this situation. Leaders of these smaller institutions say that the loss of a few key people for even relatively short periods could impair developments on campus or overseas programs for their own students. Ordinarily, they would turn down new assignments abroad, even though the opportunities were extremely attractive. However, the smaller institutions migh be members of a consortium, or there might be special circumstances or arrangements which would make an overseas development assignment practical.

4. In some colleges and universities there are resources potentially useful to AID that are now dormant or undercommitted to overseas work. To be effective they would have to be developed, organized, and cultivated by AID or by some foundation or other agency. A number of these institutions are relatively uninformed about AID needs or about how to apply their resources to meet them. They are unlikely to take the initiative in making contact with AID or any other government agency.

5. There are many universities whose commitment to overseas development work is so great that they will assign people to overseas assignments regardless of the resulting burden on other elements of the institution. In such cases of overcommitment there is always the danger of insufficient follow-through.

6. Many strong institutions with extensive resources, large research programs, and widespread off-campus activities are eager to undertake or increase overseas development work, provided it does not interfere with their central goals and objectives. They feel constrained to protect their resources against contracts or research that might alter an institution's essential character, or adversely affect the responsibility it owes to its constituency. (Some observers believe that commitments to the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission, for example, have already damaged certain institutions.)

7. The widest range of resources of potential use to AID are naturally found in the large comprehensive universities which have a diversity of graduate activities and highly developed professional schools. While AID has concentrated its attention on such universities, there are still a number of them that are not in the AID program and many whose resources exceed those so far tapped by AID.

8. Many institutions with what seems a limited program also have useful resources for overseas development—for example, those with a high concentration in teacher education or technical training. Some of these institutions are far ahead of the broad-based universities in their specialties, such as preparing students for elementary education. Some could be most effective in training foreign students on their campuses.

With respect to the interest in overseas development activities or the program of the Agency for International Development

1. Most institutions with resources of potential use to AID express the desire to help the United States government if their assistance is really essential. Their questions are: how? when? and under what circumstances?

2. Despite their willingness to be helpful, most colleges and universities feel no particular obligation to seek out AID contracts or to offer their services to government agencies in general. Institutions with either small AID contracts or none at all (or, in most cases, any other government contracts) display a good deal of naivete as to the actual commitment required of them to preform an overseas contract. The term "institutional commitment" is used verv loosely by both administrators and faculty. In some institutions it is reinforced by an overseas office on the campus and many faculty members assigned or available for overseas development work. In other institutions the commitment consists mainly of good intentions.

3. Many colleges and universities with resources potentially useful to AID point out that their first responsibility is to their own students and to research which is closely related to the faculty's teaching or professional interests. However, AID could recruit such institutions because of the challenge of overseas projects, their encouragement of academic growth and broadened horizons for administrators and faculty members, and their increase of local or regional prestige. Many institutions also recognize that an active program in overseas development attracts talented new faculty members.

4. Many universities and colleges with resources that could be useful to AID noted that (a) neither AID nor its predecessor agencies ever approached them or examined their resources, (b) AID circulates no information on its overseas development needs, and (c) the general feeling is that most universities and colleges not now in the AID program would be wasting their time and efforts if they sought AID assignments.

5. The presidents and other administrators of many institutions believe their faculties could greatly benefit from serious participation in the nation's overseas development program, and campus interest in the field has increased greatly in recent years. However, some of these institutions lack the know-how, time, manpower, or even the initiative to develop a full-scale overseas development program.

6. Some institutions have AID contracts primarily because of the interest and drive of a handful of people on campus. As overseas programs have increased, these institutions have established offices or centers to handle them, sometimes with the help of grants from the Ford Foundation and other foundations. Further grants, particularly when funds become available under the International Education Act of 1966, can stimulate an effective program of overseas development at many institutions .

7. There are institutions where AID contracts or other overseas development activities are still the concern of only a very few people. If these key people should leave, or if their own personal or professional situations should change, the resources of the institution are much less likely to be available for AID projects or any other outside contracts.

8. A number of institutions said that some of their faculty members might participate in a project or a contract operated by another college or university, but that they themselves would not or could not take the lead in such activities.

9. A few institutions with resources that could be useful to AID said they did not want to get entangled in foreign operations. However, if AID needed their resources for critical overseas work, they would make their resources available.

With respect to certain reservations about AID contracts raised by a number of universities and colleges

1. Conflicting Objectives—University administrators frequently said that the divergence between AID's objectives and those of the college or university interferes with the development of contracts that are mutually beneficial. AID needs contractors to carry out effectively those overseas assignments which the Agency determines should be carried on. The universities, these administrators say, wish to determine their own priorities and procedures in building up their educational programs and allocating their personnel. They cannot allow outside objectives to interfere.

2. Competing Claims on Personnel—There is also concern about allowing an institution's key people, both at top level and in middle management, to become too deeply involved in AID or any other off-campus activity. The best academic and administrative talent in large universities is so involved with current teachings and research, that diversion today will impair an institution's quality and well-being tomorrow and the years ahead. This concern limits the willingness of many institutions to take on new assignments, or even to continue or expand existing commitments.

3. Raiding—Some universities feel that AID treats their faculties as a pool of highly trained manpower to be raided at will, thereby interfering with an institution's development.

4. Incompatibility of Contract Work—Many universities and colleges consider AID activities as contract work, which they do not consider part of their function.

5. Difficulties with AID Contratcs and Contracting Officers—It is sometimes said that AID administrators and AID contracts are difficult to work with and that AID contracting officers are hard bargainers. (Some of the comments heard may be out of date in view of the new AID-university contract, but past impressions linger.) The red tape entailed in negotiating an AID contract is so great that many institutions with useful resources do not actively seek an AID assignment.

6. Government Contracts Now Noncompetitive—Government agencies (including AID) are rapidly becoming non-competitive in today's market. Some university administrators, as well as faculty members in a wide variety of fields, regularly command $150 to $300 a day as consultants. They also receive travel allowances and other fringe benefits that are better than those the government provides. The regulations are frequently less onerous, and there may be bonus arrangements when the assignment involves special hardships.

7. Not Best Type of Assignment—An AID assignment may not be the best type of assignment for many faculty members. A teacher who is a highly qualified and sophisticated specialist in an important narrowly-defined field may be neither a diplomat nor a linguist, and may not be a good United States representative abroad despite his top reputation at home.

8. Overhead—AID's manner of calculating overhead is still a stumbling block, particularly as to inclusions and exclusions. While present procedures are no doubt better than they were a few years ago (and improvement is, in all probability, limited by the government's General Accounting Office regulations), they still seem to be a major irritant to college and university officials. This problem discourages top administrators from seeking government contracts, reduces their interest (and thus their leadership) in any AID projects undertaken, causes them to avoid responsibility for overseas operations, and finally, if committed by their institutions, makes them reluctant to assign the best people to AID projects.

9. Long-term faculty contracts versus short-term AID contracts—Some university officials hesitate to enter into long-term commitments with faculty, in order to make sure they are available to handle AID contracts that run only a few years, or because AID's budget may be cut back or canceled in mid-stream. It can be argued, of course, that few institutions run the risk of hiring excessive faculty in view of the nationwide expansion in college enrollment.

10. Dubious Educational Value—Potential feedback into the classroom from AID projects is frequently small because of the specialized background of many university people engaged in overseas development. For example, if AID uses a medical school professor to work on a public health problem overseas, there is little chance of his experiences feeding back into his university's undergraduate liberal arts classrooms.

With respect to the organization and structure of universities and colleges in relation to AID activities

1. Many universities and colleges are not organized to manage contracts successfully. Frequently they do not assign responsibility for the follow-through so essential to contract and project success, or they place it in the hands of an understaffed or uninterested faculty member. These institutions may well have the technical and professional capacity to carry out AID contracts, but they do not know how to mobilize and administer the necessary resources.

2. AID does not have a field staff to pay constant visits to universities and colleges all over the country, describing AID's needs and program, and seeking good people and useful ideas. This lack of staff prevents AID from finding useful people who are available for overseas development assignments.

3. Many universities and colleges that have the resources for overseas development programs but no contracts at present, lack people with the imagination required to work out plans for good projects (although they might be able to carry out projects once they are launched).

4. Many potentially useful universities and colleges lack information about AID's needs and about their own relevant resources. At many institutions, there is a pervasive lack of communication and information at the highest levels of authority and responsibility.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A—Background

The study started with a meeting of the Advisory Committee (See Appendix D, page 80), a group of persons who were then or formerly had been officials of private foundations. At this meeting was discussed a list of 250 universities, colleges, and higher education consortia for possible inclusion in the sample. This list was then screened down to 150 institutions based on the comments at the meeting and further preliminary investigations. These showed that at most higher education institutions the capacity for overseas development activity and the resources that can be allocated to such activities are relatively specialized. Therefore, the sample had to be designed to bring out the most that could be learned about each particular specialization.

The screening was directed toward the development of a list which would include (a) various types of institutions; (b) institutions distributed widely geographically in order to take account of sectional differences, if any, in the variety of higher education resources; (c) both large and small instituions; (d) institutions with and without AID contracts; and (e) institutions known to have strong management, substantial administrative flexibility, wide range of program, unique activities, or extraordinary interests.

With those considerations in mind, the classification of institutions studied was consolidated into nine categories as follows:

1. Land-grant universities (see Note A below)
2. Other public universities and colleges (see Note B)
3. Public university branches (see Note C)
4. Large private universities (see Note D)
5. Liberal arts colleges (see Note E)
6. Large engineering and science universities and institutes (see Note F)
7. Junior colleges (see Note G)
8. Consortium of colleges and universities (see Note H)
9. Other higher education institutions (see Note I)

The rationale for this final classification of institutions, the significant differences between the categories, and the normal characteristics of institutions with each category, becomes obvious from a review of Part I of this study.

A list of the institutions and consortia in the sample divided into the preceding nine categories is shown in Appendix B, page 77.

Notes on Institutions in the Sample Included in the Various Categories

A. Universities included in this group are those classified by the Office of Education as being land-grant colleges and universities.

B. Included in this classification are state universities that are not land-grant institutions. Some are of recent origin; others have many years experience. One has a relatively small enrollment because of its geographic location while the others are quite large. In the past some of the state colleges were teacher education institutions primarily. They are now emerging as institutions with a broad range of educational offerings. Several state colleges are included in the sample—most of these are located in urban areas. One is of very recent origin and is concentrating on junior and senior programs but will soon be involved in graduate work.

C. Information was secured from six branches of public universities. All are located in urban areas. One is a newly-created institution, while another was created by the state taking over a city university.

D. The institutions included in this category are widely scattered geographically. Most are located in urban environments. One is now state-related, but our data cover a period when it was a private institution.

E. This category includes 25 institutions classed as liberal arts colleges. Although four use the word university in their titles, their true function is that of a liberal arts college. Included are a number of women's and men's colleges, predominately Negro colleges, and church-related institutions. Most of the colleges have less than 1,500 students enrolled and are widely scattered geographically.

F. Five engineering and science universities or institutes which are geographically separated are included in this category. Two are private and three are state institutions.

G. Five junior and community colleges and one junior college district are included in this group. Five are public institutions, while one is a private college which began conferring degrees only recently.

H. In this category are six consortia and a private nonprofit organization which has been coordinating several colleges as a consortium under AID contracts. The study of these organizations was directed at the group organization as a potential resource for AID. Some reference to the members was essential in some cases so that a better report might result.

I. In this category are four institutions which did not seem to fit directly into the other categories. Three are private, while one is a state-chartered institution.

The Sample

Within these nine categories the study team then proceeded to select institutions which were on the list discussed with the Academy's Advisory Committee with a view to satisfying the needs of each category, and selecting institutions that could be reached easily from a series of central geographic points and from which the members of the field team could operate. It was found that the budget limitations on travel could be met by confining a large part of the sample to the larger cities and their far-out as well as their close-in suburbs. The far-out suburbs included many institutions in nonurban locations—an adequate number at least to give a rounded sample. By selecting members of the field team from universities and colleges in cities in 12 different parts of the country, a wide range of coverage was achieved without extensive air travel. This took on added importance during the course of the study because of the large number of return visits to various institutions that had to be made.

During the course of the study, members of the study team contacted, on campus or in off-campus meetings, representatives of 118 higher education institutions and consortia. Only 101 of these are included in the reports submitted to AID. Of the other seventeen, four made some data available, but the information was inadequate for a report. The others, after continued contact, did not furnish any data. The budget limited the amount of time and number of field contacts that could be made. These restrictions had been anticipated and the study was designed so that this limitation on depth was negligible.

An additional 19 institutions or organizations were contacted by mail. Seven are included in the sample of 108 reports where no direct campus or off-campus contact was made. Of the other twelve contacted by mail, in four cases a direct declination on data submission was received from the president or academic vice president. Of the remaining eight, the data promised were never received or were inadequate for a complete report.

We believe the sample is so representative of higher education in the country that the adding of other institutions to increase the size of the sample would not have changed our findings and conclusions. Nevertheless, future investigations might be desirable for the purpose of (1) increasing the inventory of information; (2) updating the data in the file which obviously become obsolete with the passage of time; or (3) assessing the effect of changes in personnel, the establishment of new programs, and changes in an institution's commitment to or capacity for overseas development activities.

During the course of the study, the sample was tested and slightly amended in order to give greater weight to:

- Including "representative" institutions. The sample was not balanced statistically, however, with respect to the precise number of institutions included in each category or the number of students in institutions in each category, because these factors were not critical to the study.
- Bringing to the surface resources and capabilities for overseas development activities not previously utilized by AID. Both institutions with AID contracts and institutions without AID contracts or with an insignificant contract total in relation to the institution's capabilities and resources were examined.

When the sample had been completed, the 108 institutions for which reports are submitted represented proportions of the groups of which they were in part as shown in Table 2 on page 75.

TABLE 2. Comparison of 108 Sample Institutions With Total United States Institutions by Category

Classification	Total Number	Number in Sample	Percentage in Sample
All United States universities and colleges, fall 1965	(a) 2,184	108	5%
All public universities and colleges, fall 1965	(a) 800	48	6%
Universities and colleges that could possibly allocate resources to overseas development activities	(b) 450	75	17%
Consortia, consortia operators, and state and city systems that could possibly allocate resources to or manage overseas development projects	(b) 100	10	10%
Universities with 10,000 students or more	(b) 135	31	23%
Universities and colleges with AID contracts on December 31, 1965	(c) 126	41	33%
Universities and colleges receiving grants under Ford Foundation's Special Program in Education through September 30, 1965	(d) 70	16*	23%
Land-grant universities and colleges, 1964	(e) 68	19	28%
Predominantly Negro institutions, fall 1965	(a) 1,105	5	5%

* Excludes two Negro colleges which received special grants in 1964.

(a) Source: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1966. Tables 91, 100.

(b) Our estimate.

(c) Source: Department of State, Agency for International Development, Contract Services Division, AID-Financed University Contracts, December 31, 1965.

(d) Source: Ford Foundation's Annual Report 1965.

(e) Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1966, Table 1966, Table 196, p. 139.

APPENDIX B—Institutions in the Sample Classified by Type

A. Land-Grant Universities

- *University of Arizona
- *Auburn University
- *Colorado State University
- *University of Connecticut
- *Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
- *University of Florida
- *University of Georgia
- *University of Idaho
- *Iowa State University
- *Kansas State University
- *University of Maine
- *Montana State University
- *Oklahoma State University
- *Purdue University
- *University of Tennessee
- *Utah State University
- *Washington State University
- *University of Wyoming

B. Other Public Universities and Colleges

- *Colorado State College
- University of Colorado
- *Eastern Michigan University
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida State University
- Georgia State College
- University System of Georgia
- University of Iowa
- *University of Kansas
- Kent State University
- *University of New Mexico
- City University of New York
- *State University of New York
- University of North Dakota
- Portland State College
- *San Diego State College
- *San Francisco State College

B. Other Public Universities and Colleges (continued)

- *Southern Illinois University
- Wayne State University
- West Georgia College

C. Public University Branches

- University of California (Berkeley) +
- University of California San Diego) +
- *University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus) +
- *University of Missouri at Kansas City +
- State University of New York at Albany
- *University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee) +

D. Large Private Universities

- *Boston University
- Catholic University of America
- *University of Chicago
- *Columbia University
- University of Denver
- De Paul University
- Emory University
- *Harvard University
- Howard University
- *Northwestern University
- University of Notre Dame
- *University of Pittsburgh
- Princeton University
- Southern Methodist University
- *Teachers College (Columbia University
- Tufts University
- *Vanderbilt University

---

* Universities and colleges marked with an asterisk had AID technical assistance abroad and/or training, research, or technical assistance contracts as of September 30, 1966.

+ Also land-grant institutions.

APPENDIX B—Institutions in the Sample Classified by Type

E. Liberal Arts Colleges

- Baldwin-Wallace College
- Barnard College
- Bates College
- Berea College
- Bishop College
- Bowdoin College
- California Western University
- Claremont Colleges
- Colby College
- Colorado College
- University of Dallas
- Fisk University
- Florida Presbyterian College
- Franklin and Marshall College
- George Peabody College for Teachers
- Hiram College
- Keuka College
- Lake Forest College
- *Lincoln University
- Meredith College
- Regis College
- Skidmore College
- Springfield College
- Stetson University
- Union College

F. Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

- Case Institute of Technology
- Georgia Institute of Technology
- Illinois Institute of Technology
- *Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

G. Junior and Community Colleges

- Bronx Community College
- City College of San Francisco
- Cuyahoga Community College
- Junior College District of St. Louis
- San Diego City College
- Spring Garden Institute

H. Consortia, and Operators of Consortia, of Colleges and Universities

- Associated Colleges of the Midwest
- Associated Rocky Mountain Universities
- Committee on Institutional Cooperation
- *Educational Services Incorporated
- Great Lakes Colleges Association
- Southern Regional Education Board
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

I. Other Higher Educational Institutions

- American Institute for Foreign Trade
- Graduate Research Center of the Southwest
- Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
- New School for Social Research

---

* Universities and colleges marked with an asterisk had AID technical assistance abroad and/or training, research, or technical assistance contracts as of September 30, 1966.

APPENDIX C—Members of the Academy's AID Study Team

ROBERT Z. ALIBER
Director, Program of International Studies, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago.

JOSEPH ALLEN
Consultant to the Duke Endowment and various colleges and universities.
Formerly Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Duke Endowment; Administrator, Alfred P. Sloan National Scholarship Program.

JOHN BARDEN
Assistant to the Provost, Case Institute of Technology.

DEWEY F. BARICH
President, Detroit Institute of Technology.
Formerly Manager, Educational Affairs, Ford Motor Company.

ANNA JO BEHRENS
Lecturer in Economics, San Diego State College.
Formerly Assistant Staff Director, Committee on Higher Education in New York State; Senior Economist, United States Treasury Department.

JOHN E. BINNION
Director of the Graduate Program in Business Education, Texas Technological College.

RALPH E. BINNION
Director of Admissions, Soutehrn Methodist University.

CORWIN E. BJONERUD
Professor of Education, San Francisco State College.
Formerly Director, San Francisco State College Teacher Education Project in Liberia.

FREDERICK deW. BOLMAN
Director of Special Programs, Esso Education Foundation.
Formerly President, Franklin and Marshall College.

MURRAY M. DAVIDSON
Management Consultant, Ernst and Ernst.

APPENDIX C—Members of Study Team (Continued)

G. WAYNE GLICK
President, Keuka College.
Formerly Dean, Franklin and Marshall College.

E. BRUCE HEILMAN
President, Meredith College.
Formerly Vice President for Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers.

MILLARD F. LONG
Associate Professor of Business Economics, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Chicago.

ARTHUR W. MASON, JR.
Dean, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.
Formerly Director of the Doctoral Program, Graduate School of Business Administration, Washington University.

W. HUGH McENIRY, JR.
Dean, Stetson University.

REXFORD G. MOON, JR.
Director of Studies, Academy for Educational Development.
Formerly Director, College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board.

DAVID L. MOSCONI
Head of the Division of Research, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.

JUDITH MURPHY
Senior Program Associate, Academy for Educational Development.

ANTHONY E. SEIDL
Associate Professor of Education, University of San Francisco.

SIDNEY G. TICKTON
Vice President, Academy for Educational Development.

APPENDIX D—Members of Advisory Committee for the Academy's AID Project

Initial Members of Committee

FRANK BOWLES

President, Fund for the Advancement of Education.
Formerly President, College Entrance Examination Board.

JOHN S. EVERTON

Vice President, Education and World Affairs; Executive Director, Overseas Educational Service.
Formerly United States Ambassador to Burma; Ford Foundation representative in Burma; Associate Diretcor, Ford Foundation International Training and Research Program; President, Kalamazoo College.

LESTER W. NELSON

Educational Consultant.
Formerly Associate Program Director, Ford Foundation Education Program; Treasurer and Associate Program Director, Fund for the Advancement of Education; Secretary and Treasurer, Educational Facilities Laboratories; Past President, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

W. HOMER TURNER

Executive Director, United States Steel Foundation; Assistant to the Vice President of Finance and Controller, United States Steel Corporation.

F. CHAMPION WARD

Vice President, Ford Foundation Division of Education and Research; Trustee, Oberlin College.
Formerly Dean of the College and Professor of Humanities, University of Chicago.

ALVIN C. EURICH (Chairman)

CURTIS H. BARKER (Project Monitor)

University Relations Officer, Agency for International Development.

Subsequent Members of Committee

CHESTER M. ALTER

Chancellor (on leave), University of Denver.
Formerly Dean, Graduate School, Boston University.

RICHARD D. GATEWOOD

Education Consultant.
Formerly various positions in United States Foreign Service up to Counselor of an Embassy.

DAVID L. MOSCONI

Head of the Division of Research, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.